

Also, a bill (H. R. 12405) granting a pension to Matilda Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 12406) granting a pension to Frances M. Chronister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 12407) granting a pension to Archibald Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 12408) granting an increase of pension to Peter Mariann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12409) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Ferguson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 12410) granting an increase of pension to Lucy C. Strout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12411) granting a pension to John Huff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 12412) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Riffe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12413) granting a pension to Harrison R. Large; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12414) granting a pension to James A. G. Livingston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12415) granting a pension to John B. Eakles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12416) granting an increase of pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12417) granting an increase of pension to Frank Hartwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Michael Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1398. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the San Diego Women's Civic Center, of San Diego, Calif., relative to the American Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1399. Also (by request), petition of Coeur d'Alene Merchants' Association, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1400. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Clearfork Grange, No. 255, of Butler, Ohio, favoring the French bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1401. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the mayor and other residents, of Fresno, Calif., favoring the passage of the Lehlbach-Sterling bill (H. R. 3149); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1402. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Guy Dewhirst and sundry other citizens of Casey, Ill., favoring the passage of the Sims bill (H. R. 262), to stop gambling on races; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1403. By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of units of the National Guard of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to the Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1404. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the Department of Massachusetts of the American Legion, pledging its support to the Department of Justice in the arrest of radicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1405. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the county committee of Philadelphia County of the American Legion, relative to the general deficiency bill, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1406. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, relative to the return of the railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1407. Also, petition of Federal Highway Council, relative to legislation for good roads; to the Committee on Roads.

1408. By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, favoring civil-service retirement bill, House bill 3149; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1409. By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of citizens of Illinois, relative to the Raker bill, House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1410. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of board of directors of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, regarding the return of the railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1411. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of I. H. Brainerd, of New York City, protesting against the 1-cent postage bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1412. Also, petition of Federal Highway Council, recommending national highway development as an economy measure; to the Committee on Roads.

1413. Also, petition of the National Grange, presenting the legislative program of that organization for 1920; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1414. Also, petition of the Silk Association of America, favoring antistrike legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1415. By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Harry Ollrich Post, of the American Legion, of Mount Clemens, Mich., favoring the purchase by the Government of Selfridge Field, Mount Clemens, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1416. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Commercial Club of Jamestown, N. Dak., opposing any change in the present zone postal system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1417. Also, petition of citizens of Goldwin and vicinity, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Esch or Cummins railroad bills now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 9, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the author of peace and lover of concord. Thou dost look upon Thy children, pitying them in their ignorance, strengthening them in their weakness, guiding them when they put their trust in Thee. In this sacred moment of life we lift our hearts to Thee asking Thee to direct our steps. In all our ways may we recognize the leadership of God and walk in the path that Thou dost direct us, that the largest measure of good may come to us and through us to this land and to the world. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FOREIGN LOANS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask that an article by Frank H. Simonds, entitled "Shall we give Europe a receipted bill for ten billions," published in the New York Tribune of yesterday, may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Tribune, Feb. 8, 1920.]

SHALL WE GIVE EUROPE A RECEIPTED BILL FOR TEN BILLIONS?—FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND ITALY FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT SUCH A COURSE IS ONLY RIGHT—SENTIMENT IN AMERICA IS NOT UNDERSTOOD BY OUR ASSOCIATES IN THE WAR.

(By Frank H. Simonds.)

"WASHINGTON, D. C.

"In all the discussions of the rehabilitation of Europe which are coming from the other side of the ocean now there is an unmistakable concentration of attention upon the financial aspect and an equally patent suggestion that the easiest, perhaps the only, solution of the European difficulty, so far as it has a solution outside of time and work, will be found in the forgiveness by the United States of the \$10,000,000,000 loan by us to our European associates in the war and remaining a debt to be paid in the future. Already, moreover, we have agreed to postpone the payment of the interest on this debt for a period of time and under certain conditions.

"From the moment of the meeting of the peace conference onward Paris was filled with suggestions, all having the same general character. Thus M. Ribot, several times president of the French Council and as such prime minister and one of the most eminent of French finance ministers, early in the conference proposed that there should be a general pooling of all the debts of the allied and associated powers, and then that the total should be reapportioned on the basis of the existing wealth of the several countries and the comparative sacrifice in men and in money made by these nations in the war.

WOULD HAVE RELIEVED FRANCE.

"The result of such a reapportionment obviously would have been to reduce the French debt very greatly, since France had made the largest sacrifice during the war, and was, both by reason of her size and her wounds incident to German invasion, much weaker than Great Britain or the United States. The larger part of the French indebtedness would in this fashion have been shifted to the shoulders of the United States. This was one of several French proposals which found little sup-

port in American quarters and was accordingly dropped, despite French disappointment.

"But there is a British proposal which amounts to the same thing and is now being put forward by many Englishmen and newspapers, notably by Maynard Keynes, one of the British financial representatives at Paris, who left the conference because of his disapproval of the economic terms, and who has embodied his views in a book which has excited much comment on both sides of the Atlantic.

"Mr. Keynes's thesis, that of M. Ribot in a slightly new form, and the general European thesis is that the United States should consent to cancel the \$10,000,000,000 which it loaned to the nations associated with it in the recent struggle. This is the British proposal, which is put forward in many other forms, and Mr. Keynes's statement is only interesting as it provides a concise statement of the general notion.

"In this book Mr. Keynes points out that Europe owes the United States \$10,000,000,000; that this sum represents our loans to our associates; but that Great Britain has also loaned \$8,700,000,000 and France a little short of \$2,000,000,000. Great Britain owes us outright \$4,200,000,000. The effect of our canceling our loans would be to enable Britain to cancel hers. To be sure, what she owes us is only half of what Europe owes her; but Mr. Keynes correctly points out that since the larger share of the British loans is to Russia, Italy, and the smaller States, whose finances are difficult, no wise financier would estimate the present or even the future value of the British loans at more than 50 per cent.

"Accordingly, Britain would by our forgiveness and hers acquiesce in a mere bookkeeping transaction. She would actually stand where she did before the two operations, neither richer nor poorer. France, by contrast, would gain \$3,500,000,000, in round figures, as a result of the cancellation by the United States and by Britain of the loans made to her and by her of Italian indebtedness. Italy would gain \$4,000,000,000, Belgium rather less than \$1,000,000,000; the figures for the other countries would be trifling.

"Two things would be accomplished by this transaction—the financial problems of the French and the Italians would be enormously lightened and the possibility of quarrels between the European nations which fought Germany growing out of the hopeless intermixture of debts would be abolished. Otherwise resentment by the French at their obligations to Britain, of Italy over her debt to France and Britain, of all Europe over their debts to the United States seems to Mr. Keynes inevitable.

"Now, what is the European idea of the reasons why the United States should thus consent to tax itself for \$10,000,000,000 of principal and a very large number of other billions representing the cost of the interest on this vast capital? It is essential that this phase of the question should be understood in the United States if there is to be any real grasp of the European point of view.

"The reasons are twofold: First of all, the World War to the European mind was always our war. In it France and Great Britain, in particular, made sacrifices out of all proportion to those made by the United States, whether the measure be in money, in lives, or in anything else. If the United States had an equal interest, an equal responsibility, in the defeat of Germany, then there is logically no reason why the United States should not pay its proportionate share. Not to do this would amount to letting Europe bear our burdens and discharge our responsibilities.

"And now, when Europe has borne the greater share of the burden and finds itself at once victorious and approximately bankrupt, it sees the United States, by contrast, both prosperous and in a position to demand the payment of interest and principal on a vast debt, which represents the expenditure of our European associates in fighting that war, which was American quite as much as European. No equalization of the blood cost of victory is possible, but it cost France 1,400,000 lives to hold the Germans, the British Empire 900,000 lives to perform its mission, while the United States expended considerably less than 100,000. But if no equalization of the blood cost is possible, at least, so Europe argues, there was all the more reason for an equalization of the money tax.

WE GAVE EUROPE CAUSE.

"Now, alongside of this reasoning stands another set of circumstances which should go a long way toward explaining the European point of view. If many British and French public men and private citizens alike believe that the United States should undertake this burden, if Europe thinks that the United States has a moral obligation, it is able to find not a little support for this view in the statements made by Americans in

Europe last year. We talked in Europe in a manner which permitted Europe to believe we were capable of making such a contribution. It is not merely that Europe would now put upon us a very great burden because we are comparatively more fortunate, but that Europe would now invoke the deeds our words seemed to promise.

"I am very anxious to make this point clear to my readers because, if it is not appreciated, the present and all similar European propositions must appear to Americans as sheer and preposterous presumption, as efforts to take advantage of American generosity, as merely designing and selfish ideas. If Europe has been led to make such propositions as those of Mr. Keynes and M. Ribot, the reason is to be found in the way Americans representing the United States in official capacity talked in Europe during the peace conference.

"Europe assumed from this talk that America was prepared to become a full partner in the new world organization—in the League of Nations firm—and that it was ready to put its capital and its credit into the business without stint. Now, if this were the case, then there would be a colorable warrant at the present time for asking us for a contribution which would not be out of proportion to the contributions already made by Great Britain and France during the war, which was in a real sense the first step in setting up the League of Nations itself.

TWO POINTS OF VIEW.

"Of course, if the United States only entered the war as a limited action, as a temporary partner willing to do its part without stint from the moment it did enter until the enemy was defeated, the whole situation takes on a different aspect. On such a basis we did perform our part, rather more than less; this will hardly be challenged in Europe. And on such a basis we were and are justified in retiring, once the purely limited purpose for which we entered—namely, the defeat of Germany, because a menace to us by her submarine course—had been accomplished. Our partnership was not in the concern seeking to organize the world, but in an association striving to abolish the German peril.

"The more I compare the European view of American relation to the war with the view I find held generally in this country, the more I am led to believe that the real misunderstanding grows out of the fact that the mass of the American people understood that they had gone into the war to defeat Germany, and the mass of the European people, like their leaders, have been persuaded by American public men, by the President before all others, that our entrance into the war was the ultimate evidence of a purpose to share henceforth in the regulation of world affairs; that the war was not a protective investment, a necessary expenditure to preserve our own safety, but an actual and deliberate mission 'to make the world safe for democracy,' if one please.

ROOT OF CRITICISM.

"At the root of most of the criticism which one now hears of the United States in Europe lies the idea that we have gone back upon moral and material obligations which were expressed in the language of Mr. Wilson at Paris, in the attitude we adopted throughout the Paris conference. If France and Great Britain to-day believe that we have a duty, expressed in such terms as the proposal regarding the \$10,000,000,000 loan, the explanation must be found not in European presumption, primarily, but in American profession.

"You have an odd and far from happy situation. France and Great Britain believe that the war, in which they made such vast sacrifices, in which they received wounds from which recovery, if no longer doubtful must still be long and painful, was in the fullest sense our war as much as theirs, and that in it they did their own share and much of our share. And they can support this view alike with the figures of their own losses and with the words of American representatives in Paris. When they propose that we shall forgive them \$10,000,000,000 of debts the proposal is not, to their minds, based upon charity; it is not a request for further benefactions; it is rather a demand that we fulfill our share of obligations which we have acknowledged.

"Now, everyone knows that the American view is quite the opposite. Here in Washington and largely throughout the country I find the general opinion to be that in the World War the United States saved France and Great Britain by military interposition and then and thereafter saved Europe by the enormous contributions of food and money. That there is any further positive obligation, that we owe Europe the \$10,000,000,000 because of what Europe did for us, that we have been the beneficiaries of the sufferings and sacrifices of others, this notion does not to any extent prevail in the United States.

"As it is Europe sees the United States endeavoring to escape from moral obligations voluntarily acknowledged when these obligations involve material burdens, while the United States sees Europe attempting to take advantage of what it regards as its previous generosity by saddling upon it enormous financial burdens not properly to be charged to our account. The whole thing comes down to the simple statement of the terms of our association with our European companions in the war and after the war.

"Keynes, in his book, gives an admirable example of certain other European lines of reasoning. What, he inquires, will America get in return for the \$10,000,000,000? Why, a remaking of the peace treaty in accordance with ideas which were advocated by the President at Paris. He would have France consent to an immediate and sweeping reduction of her claims against Germany, to a renunciation of her Sarre Valley contract, so far as the question of ultimate possession is concerned. Italy would give up financial claims against Austria. Great Britain would give up certain financial claims against Germany. There would be a general reduction of economic burdens which the treaty of Versailles placed upon the German.

THE ENGLISH PLAN.

"The result would come vastly nearer to an approximation of the idea Mr. Wilson had of European peace than does the treaty of Versailles. American ideas as advocated by him unsuccessfully would be reestablished. Now, this means merely that Mr. Keynes reasons that the United States would be perfectly willing to contribute \$10,000,000,000 if as a result of the contribution the world peace were more firmly established, if what he holds to be a juster as well as a more tolerable settlement were thus to be achieved.

"It is a simple and sufficient example of the so-called 'liberal' European view. America is to-day holding back from the signing of the peace settlement; the Senate is refusing its sanction because of the character of the treaty, not as it affects the United States but as it affects Europe. We are refusing to accept the treaty because it is inequitable, so far as it concerns Germany. But if Europe consents to modify the harsher clauses affecting Germany, then the United States will not hesitate to chip in \$10,000,000,000 as its contribution to the general fund necessary to achieve this better settlement.

"I recognize that this will seem fantastic to most Americans. I recall the comment of one of my New Hampshire neighbors, which seems to me admirably to sum up a very large fraction of American opinion.

NO MORAL OBLIGATION.

"He said:

"We feel round here that we have got those European nations out of their troubles and now it is up to them to keep out of trouble in the future."

"Neither he nor any of his neighbors with whom I talked during the summer had the smallest sense of any moral obligation to Europe for Europe's sacrifices in all the struggles of the first three years of the war.

"Exactly this sentiment prevails here in Washington. It is the conviction that the United States did its full share and more than its full share, given its own responsibilities, and that there is no moral or financial claim upon it for further contributions to Europe. Even so necessary and inconsiderable a course as permitting a postponement of the payment on European loans provoked sharp and general protest in Congress, a certain manifest impatience at the thought of further European contributions.

"Of course, it is fairly obvious that there is no burden of right or wrong on either side of what amounts to a total difference of opinion between Europe and America. The difficulty is the difficulty of comprehension of one nation by another. The Germans, for example, feel that the United States, through President Wilson, totally betrayed them in the matter of the armistice, persuading them to lay down their arms on certain conditions, and then consenting to the enforcement against them, when they had been disarmed, of totally different conditions. And our associates feel, not so differently from our enemies, that we proclaimed our willingness to make any sacrifice, material or otherwise, to further the cause of certain ideas in the world, and now, when the moment for sacrifice comes, we are deliberately and consciously repudiating those obligations.

"The fact of the matter seems to be that, so far as the mass of Americans were concerned, we entered the war only when the Germans forced us into it by their submarine campaign; that, having entered, we were prepared to consent to all sacrifices to attain the defeat of the German, but that when he had been defeated, and his defeat was so complete that even our associates in the war recognized it as such, our responsibilities were at an end.

"Keynes's book is a straightforward exposition of the thesis that the present treaties of peace are bad and will end in the ruin of Europe if they are not modified, modified mainly by changing not only the terms affecting Germany, but also those affecting Austria, Poland, etc. But he sees, as the only possible means of achieving these modifications, American intervention, American contribution by cancellation of a debt of \$10,000,000,000 contracted by our European associates in fighting Germany. He reasons that such a contribution by the United States would suffice to persuade France and Italy to give up impossible claims for much more modest realities.

A WORLD DICTATORSHIP.

"But this merely means that the United States shall undertake, using its financial power as a club, to drive all the European nations to accept a different set of peace terms. It means that we shall undertake anew that dictatorship of world affairs which Mr. Wilson essayed to exercise at Paris, but did not wholly succeed in preserving to the end.

"The French, who have made greater sacrifices than the British and on the whole seem likely to receive far less in the way of material benefits, look at the thing rather differently, but the points of similarity are greater than those of divergence. They believe that we owe them a great debt by reason of their losses during three years of a war which was always ours, but in which we did not participate until 1918; that is, did not participate effectively. Thus they feel that we should both make payment of our share of the total financial costs and give them a guaranty for their future safety against a new German attack, which would again be an attack upon us as well as upon France.

"The Italian feels that the least we can do is to mind our own business and let him have the fruits of the victory, which cost him infinitely more than it cost us in lives, in treasure, in ravaged cities and fields. If the British and French in some measure feel that we are deserting them, the Italian feels that we are changing sides and actually attacking him by bolstering up his recent enemies, the Croats and the Slovenians, along the Adriatic.

"But all over Europe—in Germany, in France, in Austria, in Italy, and even in Great Britain—there is a very clear misunderstanding of the situation as the people of the United States see it. With a totally different evidence before them, peoples on either side of the ocean are arriving at utterly different conclusions. Europe is judging our present actions by the words of President Wilson and his associates spoken at Paris. When Europe, when the French and the British suggest that we resign our claims to \$10,000,000,000 owed us, in the main by those two nations, neither regards it as a pure gift; rather, to the Frenchman it is the payment of a debt our own public spokesmen have acknowledged in their utterances; to the Englishman it is a payment, made necessary now, to bring about the establishment of that system of world peace and order for which we, through the same voices, pledged all our resources.

WANTS NEW LOANS.

"In the present article I am not endeavoring to suggest that the European view is correct; that it is just; that it should be accepted in the United States. But it does seem to me essential, if there is not to be dangerous resentment and unjust criticism, that there should be a recognition in the United States of the reasons which underlie the European view. If Europe is not warranted in its present opinion, there is no less unmistakable basis for that opinion discoverable in American utterances in Paris.

"The British and the French demand for the American contribution of \$10,000,000,000 is only a first and part payment; even Mr. Keynes suggests new loans, once the old are canceled, a payment on account and for the establishment of that scheme of world ordering which Mr. Wilson advocated at Paris, declared to be the desire of his fellow countrymen and, so far as was possible, endeavored to persuade his countrymen to accept. It is our contribution to the capital stock of the League of Nations, a wholly reasonable assessment, provided only that the United States acknowledges the obligation, joins in the articles of incorporation. The weakness in the European argument lies in the belief that what American representatives did in Paris actually committed us to the partnership and that what is now going on is no less than an attempt to escape from just obligations, to repudiate our commitment. The fact that the United States was not bound by the word or the signature of the President until both had been ratified by the Senate is what has so far escaped European attention.

LORD GREY'S LETTER.

"To facilitate European understanding of American circumstance, nothing has contributed more than the recent letter of

Lord Grey, printed in the London Times; it makes clear the legal aspects of the American situation perfectly. But even this document will not at once demolish the previous notion that America is repudiating an obligation which was actually binding; still less will it remove the belief that America recognizes a moral obligation, which, at the moment at least, seems to be exactly what America does not recognize.

"Lord Grey is the first Englishman who has seriously attempted to explain to his fellow countrymen the facts in the American situation. Lloyd-George has been at pains to befuddle British minds by his constant assertion that politics alone, partisan considerations, exclusively explained the American delay in accepting the treaty. But it is equally necessary that the European, the British, situation should be explained in America and that Americans should understand the reasons why Europe asks and expects things from America which Americans do not feel that they are called upon to give and can not understand why Europe should feel justified in demanding.

"The very worst vice of the whole peace imbroglio is the extent to which it has estranged nations and peoples which, before the Paris conference met, were on a reasonably satisfactory basis of mutual understanding and sympathy."

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD, without reading, the letter from the President of the United States addressed to me and published in the papers yesterday, and also a copy of the reservations to which he gives approval.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT WILSON'S LETTER TO SENATOR HITCHCOCK WHEREIN HE ACCEPTED THE SENATOR'S RESERVATIONS.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 26, 1920.

MY DEAR SENATOR HITCHCOCK: I have greatly appreciated your thoughtful kindness in keeping me informed concerning the conferences you and some of your colleagues have had with spokesman of the Republican Party concerning the possibility of ratification of the treaty of peace, and send this line in special appreciative acknowledgment of your letter of the 22d. I return the clipping you were kind enough to inclose.

To the substance of it I, of course, adhere. I am bound to. Like yourself I am solemnly sworn to obey and maintain the Constitution of the United States. But I think the form of it very unfortunate. Any reservation or resolution stating that "the United States assumes no obligation under such and such an article unless or except" would, I am sure, chill our relationship with the nations with which we expect to be associated in the great enterprise of maintaining the world's peace.

That association must in any case, my dear Senator, involve very serious and far-reaching implications of honor and duty which I am sure we shall never in fact be desirous of ignoring. It is the more important not to create the impression that we are trying to escape obligations.

But I realize that negative criticism is not all that is called for in so serious a matter. I am happy to be able to add, therefore, that I have once more gone over the reservations proposed by yourself, the copy of which I return herewith, and am glad to say that I can accept them as they stand.

I have never seen the slightest reason to doubt the good faith of our associates in the war, nor ever had the slightest reason to fear that any nation would seek to enlarge our obligations under the covenant of the League of Nations, or seek to commit us to lines of action which, under our Constitution, only the Congress of the United States can in the last analysis decide.

May I suggest that with regard to the possible withdrawal of the United States it would be wise to give to the President the right to act upon a resolution of Congress in the matter of withdrawal? In other words, it would seem to be permissible and advisable that any resolution giving notice of withdrawal should be a joint rather than a concurrent resolution.

I doubt whether the President can be deprived of his veto power under the Constitution, even with his own consent. The use of a joint resolution would permit the President, who is, of course, charged by the Constitution with the conduct of foreign policy, to merely exercise a voice in saying whether so important a step as withdrawal from the League of Nations should be accomplished by a majority or by a two-thirds vote.

The Constitution itself providing that the legislative body was to be consulted in treaty making and having prescribed a two-thirds vote in such cases, it seems to me that there

should be no unnecessary departure from the method there indicated.

I see no objection to a frank statement that the United States can accept a mandate with regard to any territory under article 13, part 1, or any other provision of the treaty of peace, only by the direct authority and action of the Congress of the United States.

I hope, my dear Senator, that you will never hesitate to call upon me for any assistance that I can render in this or any other public matter.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Inclosure referred to:

"2. The United States assumes no obligation to employ its military or naval forces or the economic boycott to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any other article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war, shall, by act or joint resolution so provide. Nothing herein shall be deemed to impair the obligation in article 16 concerning the economic boycott."

Proposed substitute reservations by Mr. HITCHCOCK to take the place of those proposed by Senator LODGE:

"That any member nation proposing to withdraw from the league on two years' notice is the sole judge as to whether its obligations referred to in Article I of the League of Nations have been performed as required in said article.

"That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers to be in international law a domestic question such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

"That the national policy of the United States known as the Monroe doctrine, as announced and interpreted by the United States, is not in any way impaired or affected by the covenant of the League of Nations and is not subject to any decision, report, or inquiry by the council or assembly.

"That the advice mentioned in Article X of the covenant of the league which the council may give to the member nations as to the employment of their naval and military forces is merely advice which each member nation is free to accept or reject according to the conscience and judgment of its then existing Government, and in the United States this advice can only be accepted by action of the Congress at the time in being, Congress alone under the Constitution of the United States having the power to declare war.

"That in case of a dispute between members of the league if one of them have self-governing colonies, dominions, or parts which have representation in the assembly, each and all are to be considered parties to the dispute, and the same shall be the rule if one of the parties to the dispute is a self-governing colony, dominion, or part, in which case all other self-governing colonies, dominions, or parts, as well as the nation as a whole, shall be considered parties to the dispute, and each and all shall be disqualified from having their votes counted in case of any inquiry on said dispute made by the assembly."

REMOVAL OF SOLDIER DEAD FROM FRANCE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter relating to the subject of the removal of the dead bodies of soldiers from France to America which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Post-Office Box 1404,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1920.

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS.

Sir: Your talk with the "National League to Bring Home the Soldier Dead" and a few remarks linger in my mind. And I would state that in October, 1919, I was in Paris for the purpose of personally identifying a body said to be that of my husband, Lieut. Col. R. H. Griffiths, a Spanish War veteran and officer of Philippine Constabulary, who had (as temporary commissioned officer) three years' experience with the British Army before America declared war, but reported killed in action in Picardy on two dates, at the time the American First Division arrived in Picardy, and before action on that sector. History relates that the First Division arrived at Picardy on April 25, 1918, and Lieut. Col. R. H. Griffiths was reported killed on the 23d of April officially, and on the 28th of April, 1918; so, as they had only arrived there, they plainly were not in action.

Further, I am informed from The Adjutant General's Department that a number of important communications and telegrams in this case are missing from War Department files.

Therefore I was permitted to visit Paris for the purpose of personally identifying the body buried as his. Col. Leon Kromer flatly refused to exhume the body; could not get labor, etc.

But a Red Cross man—that is, a man with a Red Cross on his shoulder (such as are sold in every trinket shop in Paris)—happened in, wanted to exhume a body, bring it to Paris for cremation, and rebury it in the same cemetery or any place else arranged.

Col. Kromer bluffed that it could not be done. The man showed him a bunch of papers, and then said: "The people of soldiers in America are very rich and are willing to pay any price to have this done. Money and expense are no object."

At this Col. Kromer became very affable and called a chauffeur, ordered that this gentleman be taken to some other official for another permit. Then Col. Kromer turned to me with: "Madam, it is positively against the regulations to exhume bodies." But, being classed as the widow of an officer, with \$82 a month to live on, I did not make a statement of unlimited payment, and had to go to London and cable to Washington for further instructions. Now, sir, Col. Kromer's name is spelled like "kultur," with a "K." His manner to me was similar. Anybody wearing a Red Cross could exhume and remove bodies. How many cremated bodies have been removed from American cemeteries in France? Col. Kromer was chief of the Graves Registration Service in October, 1919, and wore military intelligence insignia. Col. Kromer's attitude was supported by Gen. Connor.

Respectfully,

ANNA M. GRIFFITHS.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION (S. DOC. NO. 214).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$956.63 to settle claims for damages by collision, river and harbor work, which have been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the State of Kansas emergency hospital equipment to be used temporarily in emergency hospitals to be established in that State, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8819) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DENT, and Mr. FIELDS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 11368, the Indian appropriation bill, to dispose of Senate amendments Nos. 114 and 115 in manner and form as if the House had receded from its disagreement to said amendments and had agreed to the same, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3327) granting certain rights of way and exchanges of the same across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, in the State of Utah, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I send to the desk several telegrams. I ask that the first one be read and that the others be printed in the RECORD, and that all be ordered to lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

Senator LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:
DURHAM, N. C., February 7, 1920.

Speaking for the millers of North Carolina, I protest against the evidence of bad faith in the proposed Gronna bill terminating wheat control. Millers of this State own large amounts of wheat bought from

Grain Corporation; they also have made heavy sales of flour against these purchases. I believe the condition which caused wheat to decline in Kansas City 20 cents per bushel during the past three days may cause still further decline to materially lower basis than that guaranteed by the Federal Government. The repudiation of this pledge may cause financial losses to millers and merchants of such proportions as to become a national disaster.

A. M. SPEED.

The remaining telegrams were also ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATESVILLE, N. C., February 7, 1920.

United States Senator LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest against the bad faith evidenced in proposed Gronna bill terminating wheat control. We own a large amount of wheat, purchased from Grain Corporation, against which we have sold flour for future delivery. The mere introduction of this bill has caused cash wheat to decline 20 cents a bushel in last few days, and its passage would undoubtedly cause wheat to fall below present Government guaranteed price, thereby causing untold loss to millers, grain dealers, flour handlers, and farmers, who have been depending upon the guaranteed price per agreements made in good faith with Grain Corporation.

STERLING MILLS.

STATESVILLE, N. C., February 7, 1920.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily indorse William Speed's telegram protesting against the abrupt termination of wheat control; if possible, would make it stronger. It might be a calamity to millers and merchants as well as to farmers still owning wheat.

STARR MILLING CO.

STATESVILLE, N. C., February 7, 1920.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily indorse William Speed's telegram protesting against the abrupt termination of wheat control; if possible, would make it stronger. It might be a calamity to millers and merchants as well as to farmers still owning wheat.

STATESVILLE FLOUR MILL CO.

STATESVILLE, N. C., February 7, 1920.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily indorse William Speed's telegram protesting against the abrupt termination of wheat control; if possible, would make it stronger. It might be a calamity to millers and merchants as well as to farmers still owning wheat.

CITY FLOUR MILLS CO.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a telegram similar to the one just read from the Merchants' Exchange of Seattle, Wash., and the Northwest Pacific Grain Dealers' Association, protesting against the repeal of the wheat price guaranty legislation. I ask that it may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. JONES of Washington presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Puget Sound Quarterly Meeting of Friends, of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Joint Postal Association, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Lehlbach-Sterling retirement bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial signed by citizens of Medford, Oreg., concerning the League of Nations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDFORD, OREG., February 7, 1920.

To Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE and Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, United States Senators:

The undersigned citizens of Medford, Oreg., respectfully represent that they are in entire accord with the statement of Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, made to Mr. Bullitt in Paris to the effect "that if the American people understood what was in the treaty of peace they would protest against its ratification"; and we further urge that the Senate insist upon a ratification, if at all, with the reservations known as the Lodge reservations, and that unless ample reservations are made thoroughly Americanizing the treaty that the Senate vote against its ratification. We believe that if it be ratified with the Lodge reservations the interests of America will be protected, but not without the said reservations.

Wm. M. Coling, attorney (opposed to any League of Nations); Gus. Cury, lawyer; K. G. Riddell, dentist (opposed to any League of Nations); Bert R. Elliott, dentist; G. M. Roberts, district attorney, Jackson City, Oreg.; E. G. Brown, merchant; Will G. Steel, commissioner Crater Lake National Park; S. S. Smith, manager Mail-Tribune; D. Elroy Getchell, banker (opposed to any League of Nations); W. J. Warner.

Mr. COLT. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, recommending legislation providing for an immigration station at the port of Providence, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, ETC.,
IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January session, A. D. 1920.

Resolution recommending to Congress the passage of legislation providing for an immigration station in the port of Providence.

Whereas the development of the port of Providence is seriously handicapped and the proper examination of immigrants prevented by the absence of a suitable immigration station; and
Whereas the erection of such an immigration station with the proper facilities for the care and custody of immigrants is essential: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully requests the Senators and Representatives in Congress to urge the passage of suitable legislation which will provide such an immigration station, and the secretary of state is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Providence, February 2, 1920.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of the original resolution passed by the general assembly and approved by the governor on the 15th day of January, A. D. 1920.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid this 2d day of February, in the year 1920.
[SEAL.] J. FRED PARKER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. COLT. I also present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, ETC.,
IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January session, A. D. 1920.

(Approved Feb. 4, 1920.)

Resolution favoring Senate joint resolution 102, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, "To equalize the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy."

Whereas the maintenance of the highest standard of efficiency in the conservation of life and property from the perils of the sea is of great importance to the commercial and shipping interests of the State of Rhode Island; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, Senate joint resolution 102, which has for its purpose the equalization of the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy, said Senate joint resolution having been favorably reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the provisions of said joint resolution be enacted into law at as early a date as practicable in order that the Coast Guard may be able to retain its trained personnel, and to secure by enlistment, suitable recruits to man its vessels and stations which has become difficult on account of the greater rates of pay prevailing in practically all business and commercial pursuits, which conditions threaten the efficiency of the service; and
Whereas it would be detrimental to the commercial and shipping interests of the State of Rhode Island if for any reason the efficiency of the Coast Guard should become impaired: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, That the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island be, and hereby are, earnestly requested to give their support to Senate joint resolution 102 and to use their efforts to secure its early passage by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island, and to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Providence, February 7, 1920.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of the original resolution passed by the general assembly and approved by the governor on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1920.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid this 7th day of February, in the year 1920.
[SEAL.] J. FRED PARKER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of the Rotary Club of York; of Anthony Wayne Post, No. 418, American Legion, of Wayne; of Milton Lafayette Bishop Post, No. 301, American Legion, of Connellsville; of Philip J. Meaney Post, No. 249, American Legion, of Philadelphia; of Octagon Post, No. 291, American Legion, of Galeton; of Willet C. Sanford Post, No. 433, American Legion, of Morrisville; of Oak Lane Post, No. 263, American Legion, of Philadelphia; of Maneto Post, No. 270, American Legion, of Philadelphia; of Oscar M. Hykes Post, No. 223, American Legion, of Shippensburg; of Post No. 438, American Legion, of Knoxville; of Logan Post, No. 376, American Legion, of Philadelphia; and of Victory Post, No. 25, American Legion, of Selinsgrove, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Davey sedition bill, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dudley, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of race gambling information and odds, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Mount Union and Renovo and of Local Lodge No. 768, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of East Stroudsburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins railroad bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the retention of the antistrike clause in the so-called Cummins railroad bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Allentown, Pa., favoring private ownership and operation of railroads, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Local Lodge No. 577, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., and of Local Lodge No. 11, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the summary deportation of certain aliens, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the General George A. McCall Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of West Chester; of Lafayette Post, No. 217, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Easton; of John F. Melvin Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Bradford; of Post No. 58, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Harrisburg; and of Captain George J. Lawrence Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Minersville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 619, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cessna, Pa., remonstrating against the United States going to war with Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Reading, Pa., remonstrating against Japanese aggression in Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Cliveden Improvement Association, of Germantown, Pa., praying for the enactment of daylight-saving legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Bucks County Historical Society, of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed acquisition by condemnation by the Government of certain lands in Pennsylvania as a site for a Government arsenal, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, Meadville, Johnstown, Conemaugh, Bethlehem, and Williamsport, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of superannuated Government employees, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Federal urban mortgage bank bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of the Pittsburgh Section of the American Chemical Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the encouragement and protection of the American dye industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of the Council of the Diocese of Texas of the Protestant Episcopal Church, praying for the adoption of the League of Nations covenant, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ELKINS presented a memorial of the executive board of District No. 17, United Mine Workers of America, of Charleston, W. Va., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Sterling-Graham sedition bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of Post No. 132, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Junction City; of Lewis Post, No. 294, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Dodge City; and of Blue Post, No. 250, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of Clarence Lieurance Post, No. 2, American Legion, of Neosha Falls, and of sundry citizens of

Marion County, Cherokee County, and Harper County, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of occupants and claimants of unsurveyed public land in township 8 north of range 2 west of Salt Lake meridian, Utah, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Kathryn Walker (Rept. No. 419); and

A bill (S. 2528) to grant certain lands to the city of Pocatello, State of Idaho, for conserving and protecting the source of its water supply and as a municipal park site (Rept. No. 420).

THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 300, submitted by Mr. McCUMBER on the 6th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pensions, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3884) to amend the Federal reserve act and to enlarge the powers of Federal reserve banks and member banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3885) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Ochoco National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3886) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Sturm, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3887) for the relief of Stephen Olop (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3888) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shoemaker (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3889) granting a pension to Watson D. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

A bill (S. 3890) authorizing the acquisition of a site for the United States Department of State; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate not exceeding \$30,000 for the transportation of foreign mails by airplanes and seaplanes, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

LOANS MADE UPON GRAIN.

Mr. GRONNA. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I ask that the resolution may be read. It is very short.

The resolution (S. Res. 301) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate instruct the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and report to the Senate the amount of loans made upon grain by the Federal Reserve and other banks, and to investigate the alleged causes of withdrawal of funds to provide for loans, extension, or renewal of loans upon wheat and other cereals.

CAR SHORTAGE.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I submit another resolution, which I ask may be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 302) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate instruct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the alleged lack of supply and failure to supply an adequate number of stock cars and cars for transporting

grain and other farm products during the period of Government operation of railroads, and the charges of willful interference by certain officials of the Railroad Administration with the successful operation of the railroads by the Government, and to report the findings to the Senate as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. I reserve the right to object. It seems to me if the subject of the resolution is a matter for investigation it ought to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which is charged with the duty of considering all interstate-commerce questions.

Mr. GRONNA. I considered that question quite fully. The resolution, however, deals with agricultural products. As the Senator knows, I think nearly every Senator has received telegrams asking that something be done to relieve the congestion in the agricultural sections of the country and to furnish them cars for the shipment of wheat. The resolution simply asks for information, and I trust the Senator from Utah will not object to it. I do not see how it can possibly do any harm or interfere with any of the work done by the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall object to the consideration of the resolution if the Senator insists that the investigation shall be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is the proper function of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, if an investigation of this character is required, to conduct such investigation. I think it would lead to confusion and complications if we should repudiate the rules of the Senate and ignore committees whose duties and powers are well defined and understood. We should respect committees and not seek to deprive them of authority conferred by rules, and thus bring confusion and demoralization in legislative procedure. Suppose that complaints were made of the inadequate supply of cars for mining purposes and for the transportation of ores and coal. Could it be contended that under the rules of the Senate such complaints should be sent to the Committee on Mines and Mining? We have a Committee on Interstate Commerce, charged with the duty of making investigation, when investigation is required, of all interstate-commerce problems and questions. If the Senator will amend his resolution so as to refer it to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I shall be glad to vote for it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Utah has the right to object. I fully realize that the resolution can not be passed this morning if objection is made.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. GRONNA. Just a moment. I can assure the Senator, however, that there is an absolute necessity for more cars, and an investigation of this sort can do no harm. I could show the Senator, if I wanted to take up the time of the Senate, I think probably 50 telegrams which I have received this morning calling attention to the absolute necessity of having cars furnished for the shipment of grain.

I have no objection to permitting the Committee on Interstate Commerce to make an investigation if it sees fit, but why should the Senator from Utah object to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry making the investigation, which deals with agricultural products and which has the responsibility of dealing with the marketing of agricultural products? I ask, Why does the Senator object to a resolution of this kind?

Mr. KING. I suggested that I would be willing to have the resolution considered if the Senator would amend it and refer it to the proper committee. If the Senator will take that course, I shall vote to have that committee make the investigation.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator objects, I give notice that I shall move to take it up to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I did not hear the reading of the resolution. I assume, however, from the discussion that it relates to the car supply as affecting the grain market.

Mr. GRONNA. It does.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion, I this morning had a letter from the Toledo Produce Exchange advising that on a survey which was made I think on either Friday or Saturday they were short nearly 500 cars. I think that situation exists throughout the country largely.

Also, if the Senator will permit me to make the suggestion, a few days ago I had a large number of telegrams from Cleveland, and among them a telegram from the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. The chamber of commerce advised that there was a very general shortage of cars in all branches of industry, and spoke of one company that had at that time nearly 600 cars of freight in the warehouse, and the number of cars was negligible. Throughout Ohio, and particularly in the coal region,

there is a shortage of car supply running from 50 to 75 per cent at the mines.

I call attention to this fact as indicating that it is not the grain interests that alone are suffering. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has had under investigation the question of coal supply to a very large extent, and the thought has occurred to me that in view of the general situation it might perhaps be better to have the resolution go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of his resolution.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I have information from two large lumber concerns in the State of Arkansas whose requirements demand that they shall have at least 200 cars a month to take care of their output, and they state that they have not had more than 25 cars a month recently. They employ from 500 to 1,500 men. One of the concerns had to close down one of its mills, and the other concern writes me that it will be necessary to shut down its mills unless the car supply is improved. That shows the condition there. There is a shortage of cars, and I do not see why the Committee on Interstate Commerce would not be the best vehicle or agency for the investigation of the condition, because it seems to be general throughout the country.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to state the reason why I believe the resolution ought to have immediate consideration. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas, and also in reply to the Senator from Ohio, that there is not the urgent demand for cars for either of the products which they have mentioned that there is for wheat, and for this reason: As we all know, the law which was enacted March 4, 1919, guaranteeing a certain price for wheat expires by limitation on the 1st day of June. It is alleged—and it seems that there has been an understanding to make conditions such—that as much grain as possible should be moved to the grain centers all at once before that time.

The Senate has just adopted a resolution which I introduced calling for information as to why the Federal reserve and other banks are refusing to extend loans upon grain to farmers and to grain men. I have information—and I have the original letters before me—alleging that there must have been a misunderstanding with reference to the question of supplying cars for shipment of the grain which remains in the farmers' bins. I do not believe there are 50,000,000 bushels on the farms throughout the United States besides what is needed for seed and feed. There is a lot of grain in the smaller elevators of the country. These men have paid a high price—a much higher price than the price guaranteed by the Government—and if they want it all to flow into the terminal markets at one time, naturally it will depress the price.

If it were not during the morning hour, I would take sufficient time to read letters and telegrams from grain men showing that there will be no market for the grain outside of the Grain Corporation, thereby forcing down prices and involving a loss to those men from 50 cents to 75 cents a bushel. I do not say that I concur in this, however, but I call attention to the statements made.

I think that is an answer to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], as it demonstrates there is a reason why we should take immediate action in this matter, and that cars should be now furnished in order that the men who have sold grain to arrive at a high price may be protected.

Mr. KIRBY. I have no objection to immediate action, but I thought the other committee was the better agency to investigate this subject. If the mills of which I spoke have to be shut down, 3,000 men will be out of employment.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; but let me say to the Senator, if he will permit me to finish my statement, that he has not heard of any reduction having been made in the price of the commodity which he mentioned. Instead of that commodity declining in price, it has advanced. I am sure the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has heard no complaint from the men who have written to him that the price of their commodity has declined; on the contrary, prices have been soaring.

The position with reference to grain is somewhat different. I have a letter before me here from a grain-elevator man in North Dakota stating that the price of grain in the city of Devils Lake declined from 50 to 70 cents a bushel last week. That was before my bill terminating the Grain Corporation was introduced. So I say, Mr. President, there is a good reason why this resolution should be given immediate attention and should be at once passed.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I do not now desire to discuss the resolution. I simply wish to say that there were many

telegrams received last week asking for cars, and Senators from Northwestern States, including myself, urged the Federal Railway Administration to send cars to the Northwest. We received assurances that that would be done, and a man was sent out to take charge of the matter. Of course, I have not had a report as to how many cars have been sent. I have no doubt there is a shortage of cars, but I think we have taken steps to remedy the situation so far as the shortage of cars will permit. I do not know definitely as to the details.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that the lumber industry in the State of Washington is threatened with stagnation and ruin by the lack of cars. If there is to be an investigation as to the shortage of cars, I desire to have it include the lumber industry as well as other industries. I do not propose now to take any further time, but I simply wish to make this statement.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] that, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to his resolution in regard to cars for grain shipment. I think it is very important that grain shipments should be made; but I also wish to say that I have received telegrams from representatives of the coal interests in my State to the effect that at some of the mines they have no cars whatever, the result of which is that the coal miners are not employed one-half of the time and that they are leaving that section of the country and are seeking other sections where they can get employment. That has produced absolute stagnation. I merely mention this fact to show that the car shortage is universal; that it does not apply to any one industry or to any one product. The people of my section are saying that they can get no cars. I have made it my business to apply to the Director General of Railroads for help. I repeat, the fact is that in the coal-mining region referred to they have been obliged to stop work because of the lack of cars. I do not object to the Senator's section of the country having cars for the shipment of grain; I think it is important they should have them; but the shortage of cars applies to all industries and all products, including those of my State.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, in support of what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has said in this particular instance, I desire to say that the coal industry is the important industry at this time. When Lloyd-George was speaking of a threatened strike in the Cardiff region of Wales he said: "Coal is life." If the supply of coal is threatened, elevators will cease operations, the transportation system itself will halt, mills and factories everywhere will be forced to suspend, the lumber industry, the sawmills, will stop with the logs on the way. There can be no activity in any industry or enterprise in this country without a supply of fuel.

More than that, we have but recently, partially and temporarily, adjusted the differences between the operators and the operatives in the coal industry. A majority of the miners are foreign born and do not understand the causes of the industrial unrest or the reason for unemployment, and if the mines stop now because of a lack of transportation that stoppage may be followed by disastrous results, which can not be remedied even by an adequate supply of cars. For that reason I regard it as more important that the mines should be kept running at this time than that any other industry should receive immediate attention.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has the resolution offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] gone over under the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It went over 15 minutes ago.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. GRONNA. I merely want to ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order has been called for and that is the end of it. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate—

Mr. STANLEY. I think I was in the regular order, but I take pleasure in advising the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] that I have concluded my remarks.

DEPARTMENTAL PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order to conserve paper, and also to conserve the Treasury of the United States, Congress on March 1, 1919, passed an act conferring upon the Joint Committee on Printing certain powers. Under that act there was an investigation made of the publications of the different

departments of the Government. The committee instructed the different departments to discontinue certain publications that were being printed in different parts of the country.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I have before me now samples of publications printed at the different posts in the United States—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Michigan call for the regular order?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to say nothing more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Michigan to call for the regular order. The Senator from Utah is not proceeding in regular order.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

STATEMENT BY MR. HERBERT HOOVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further resolutions?

Mr. BORAH. I do not wish now to take up the time of the Senate in comment, but, as I desire to comment later, I ask to have read the statement of Mr. Hoover which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

HOOVER NOT TO TIE HIMSELF TO UNDEFINED PARTISANSHIP, SAYS HE IS NOT A CANDIDATE—HE WILL "VOTE FOR PARTY THAT STANDS FOR THE LEAGUE" AND COULD NOT VOTE WITH ORGANIZATION "IF IT WERE DOMINATED BY GROUPS WHO HOPE FOR ANY FORM OF SOCIALISM"—THANKS FRIENDS FOR ACTIVITIES.

Herbert Hoover last night issued the following statement defining his attitude toward the Presidency:

"In order to answer a large number of questions all at once, let me emphasize that I have taken a day off from the industrial conference in Washington to come to New York solely to attend to pressing matters in connection with the children's relief. I want to say again, I have not sought and am not seeking the Presidency. I am not a candidate. I have no 'organization.' No one is authorized to speak for me politically.

"As an American citizen by birth and of long ancestry, I am naturally deeply interested in the present critical situation. My sincere and only political desire is that one or both of the great political parties will approach the vital issues which have grown out of the war and are now with a clear purpose looking to the welfare of our people, and that candidates capable of carrying out this work should be nominated.

WILL VOTE WITH PARTY FOR LEAGUE.

"If the treaty goes over to the presidential election (with any reservations necessary to clarify the world's mind that there can be no infringement of the safeguards provided by our Constitution and our nation-old traditions), then I must vote for the party that stands for the league. With it there is hope not only of the prevention of war but also that we can safely economize in military policies. There is hope of earlier return of confidence and the economic reconstruction of the world.

"I could not vote with a party if it were dominated by groups who seek to set aside our constitutional guarantees for free speech or free representation, who hope to reestablish control of the Government for profit and privilege. I could not vote with a party if it were dominated by groups who hope for any form of Socialism, whether it be nationalization of industry or other destruction of individual initiative. Both of these extremes, camouflaged or open, are active enough in the country to-day. Neither of these dominations would enable those constructive economic policies that will get us down from the unsound economic practices which of necessity grew out of the war, nor would they secure the good will to production in our farmers and workers or maintain the initiative of our business men. The issues look forward; not back.

WANTS TWO GREAT PARTIES ONLY.

"I do not believe in more than two great parties; otherwise combinations of groups could, as in Europe, create a danger of minority rule. I do believe in party organization to support great ideals and to carry great issues and consistent policies. Nor can any one man dictate the issues of great parties. It appears to me that the hope of a great majority of our citizens in confronting this new period in American life is that the great parties will take positive stands on the many issues that confront us, and will select men whose character and associations will guarantee their pledges.

"I am being urged by people in both parties to declare my allegiance to either one or the other. Those who know me know that I am able to make up my mind when a subject is clearly defined. Consequently, until it more definitely appears what party managers stand for, I must exercise a prerogative of American citizenship and decline to pledge my vote blindfold.

"I am not unappreciative of the many kind things that my friends have advanced on my behalf. Yet I hope they will realize my sincerity in not tying myself to undefined partisanship."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if it is in order, I move to refer the communication of Mr. Hoover to Chairman Hays's committee of 181 on platform. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Idaho has read into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Hoover. I regard it as an attack upon the American Federation of Labor. I note as a hopeful sign that he is opposed to class or group domination.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 7th instant, approved and signed the act (S. 3418) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading and unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suspend paragraph 1 of Rule XIII and reconsider the vote by which the Senate tabled the motion to reconsider the vote rejecting the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany with the reservations adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I desire to object to the request for unanimous consent, but I should like to make an inquiry before we proceed. Are we proceeding at this time with reference to the treaty, including any proceedings with reference to bringing it back, under cloture?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has had some experience with the Senate on treaty questions. Nevertheless, the Chair has courage enough to say, as the question is propounded, that, after the vote shall be reconsidered, unless the treaty shall be rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, or unless by unanimous consent the cloture rule shall be modified, the Chair will hold that it comes back under the cloture adopted by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Then, Mr. President, as I understand the ruling of the Chair, it is to the effect that cloture will obtain unless the treaty is rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations or unless by unanimous consent the cloture rule is modified?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is the program to rerefer the treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. LODGE. If my request for unanimous consent is granted or a motion to suspend the rules is carried, by intention is to follow it by a motion to recommit the treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. If I may be permitted to ask another question, is it the purpose of the leader of the minority to support the motion to refer the treaty to the committee?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The disposition on this side of the aisle is to cooperate in any course that will bring the treaty promptly back into the Senate for consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Bring it back from the committee?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Then the program is understood to be to refer the treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this action not merely implies but assures the future consideration of the treaty without cloture?

Mr. LODGE. If the motion to recommit is adopted there will be no cloture rule appended to it, unless the Senate chooses to apply the cloture rule, which is always within its power.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am addressing my inquiry to what I dare say may be the brief interval between the consideration of the treaty and its recommitment to the committee. I wonder if during that interval it is contemplated that objection will be raised, and effective objection, to the recommitment of the treaty?

Mr. LODGE. The motion to recommit is in order, whether the treaty comes back under the cloture rule or whether it does not. Of course, if the Senate votes down the motion to recommit, then a new situation is presented.

Mr. McCORMICK. Then, Mr. President, what do I understand that situation to be?

Mr. LODGE. It will be before us under the ruling of the Chair, as I understand, with the exhausted cloture appended to it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that cloture will apply until recommitment?

Mr. LODGE. That is my understanding. That motion can be made at any time, of course.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Chair has ruled that cloture will apply until the treaty is recommitted, but what will apply between the time this unanimous consent is given and the time the treaty is recommitted?

Mr. McCORMICK. That is the precise inquiry which I addressed to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair be correct, it comes back under the cloture rule. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BORAH. Then there could be no debate except such debate as Senators may have left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands, a motion to recommit will be made by the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Chair believes that motion is not debatable unless we should run along until 2 o'clock.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I object to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. Then, Mr. President, under the notice which I gave, which I will ask to have read, I move to suspend paragraph 1 of Rule XIII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be read.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1920.

Notice by Mr. LODGE: "I hereby give notice, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that on Monday, February 9, 1920, I will move to suspend paragraph 1 of Rule XIII, in order that the Senate may be given an opportunity to reconsider its final vote upon the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany, including the covenant of a League of Nations, and the subsequent action taken to prevent a reconsideration of such vote."

Mr. LODGE. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This requires a two-thirds vote. The roll will be called.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when Mr. BANKHEAD's name was called). My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is detained from the Chamber on account of sickness. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is absent on account of the sickness of his mother. They have arranged a pair between them on matters relating to the treaty, and I desire to announce the fact.

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. DILLINGHAM's name was called). The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is absent, I think on account of illness. He told me he was paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. On this question, I know, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. RANSDELL (when Mr. GAY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GAY] is absent on a congressional commission investigating conditions in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. BORAH (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of California was called). The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of the illness of his wife. I have agreed to take care of him with a pair during his absence. I am assured, however, that if present he would vote as I shall vote on this matter. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. I understand, however, that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], whose absence has already been announced. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. NEWBERRY's name was called). I announce the absence of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], and state that he has a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on all matters except those affecting the League of Nations. I am authorized to

state that if the junior Senator from Michigan were present he would vote "yea" on this motion.

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. SHIELDS's name was called). The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is absent on the business of the Senate; that is to say, he is investigating the murders of a large number of American citizens that have been committed by Mexican bandits and outlaws. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. However, with his consent I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. I am paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I would vote "yea." He is also paired with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. I understand that, if present, he would vote "yea." I will therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] on account of illness.

Mr. GRONNA. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent from the Chamber because of illness.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask if I heard the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] transfer his pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]?

Mr. HARRISON. I transferred my pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER].

Mr. LODGE. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON. Then I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK].

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

Mr. GERRY. The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 63, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—63.

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Harrison	Myers	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Stanley
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Townsend
Elkins	Kellogg	Phelan	Trammell
Fernald	Keyes	Phipps	Underwood
Fletcher	King	Pittman	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Glass	Lodge	Robinson	Watson
Gore	McCumber	Sheppard	Wolcott
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

NAYS—9.

Borah	Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter
Brandagee	Knox	Norris	Sherman
France			

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	Fall	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gay	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Spencer
Dial	Kendrick	Penrose	Swanson
Dillingham	Kenyon	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	La Follette	Shields	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted to suspend the rule for the purposes stated in the notice of the Senator from Massachusetts, the rule is suspended.

Mr. LODGE. I now move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate tabled the motion to reconsider the vote rejecting the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany with the reservations adopted by the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the motion, first, because the Senator from Massachusetts is not entitled to make it, not having voted with the prevailing side; second, because, the matter sought to be reconsidered has already been once reconsidered; and, third, because it was finally disposed of on the 19th day of November, 1919, at a preceding session of Congress; that on that day that session of Congress adjourned without day, and hence it is now too late under general parliamentary law to make the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. And from that decision I appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. An appeal from the ruling of the Chair? The VICE PRESIDENT. These motions and questions are not debatable before 2 o'clock.

Mr. NORRIS. On the appeal I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that was made awhile ago with reference to my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and with the same understanding, that he would vote as I shall vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). Repeating the statement that I made a moment ago, I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I again announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], and understanding that, if present, he would vote as I shall vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement heretofore made regarding my pair, in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement heretofore made as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when Mr. REED's name was called). I desire to announce a pair between the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. SHIELDS's name was called). I make the same announcement with regard to my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and ask that it may stand for the day.

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is absent on the business of the Senate; that is to say, he is investigating the murders of a large number of American citizens that have been committed by Mexican bandits and outlaws. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same statement as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement, as on the previous roll call, as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the affirmative). Making the same announcement with regard to my pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

Mr. GERRY. The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL],

the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—62.

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Harrison	Myers	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Stanley
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Kellogg	Phelan	Underwood
Fernald	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
Fletcher	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pomerene	Warren
Gerry	Lenroot	Ransdell	Watson
Glass	Lodge	Robinson	Wolcott
Gore	McCumber	Sheppard	
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

NAYS—10.

Borah	Gronna	Norris	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Knox	Polindexter	
France	McCormick	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bankhead	Fall	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gay	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Spencer
Dial	Kendrick	Penrose	Swanson
Dillingham	Kenyon	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	La Follette	Shields	Williams

So the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to reconsider the vote by which the Senate tables the motion to reconsider the vote rejecting the resolution of ratification with the reservations adopted by the Senate.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the treaty of peace with Germany, together with the reservations adopted by the Senate and the resolution of ratification, with instructions to report the treaty back immediately, together with said reservations and the ratifying resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he would be willing to omit in the third line "reservations adopted by the Senate," and in next to the bottom line "together with such reservations," so it would read in this way:

I move to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the treaty of peace with Germany, together with the resolution of ratification, with instructions to report the treaty back immediately without recommendation.

That will leave the whole matter in the Senate, where it can be considered, and will leave it practically where it was.

Mr. LODGE. My purpose, and my sole purpose, in what I am endeavoring to do this morning is to bring back the treaty before the Senate in the quickest possible way. Whatever work we are going to do in the Senate will be done, if done at all, by modifications of the reservations which the Senate adopted. All those reservations could be offered again. No right is cut off. Any reservation can be offered when the treaty is reported by the committee. I am certain that it will save the time of the Senate to bring the reservations back, because they are going to be the subject of discussion, and it is to them that modifications, if any, will be offered. To leave them out, it seems to me, we run the risk of delay and revising the whole treaty from beginning to end.

I think it is in the interest of prompt action to bring the treaty back to-morrow with the resolution of ratification and with the reservations. The resolution of ratification, of course, can not be presented until we get into the Senate and the treaty will come back in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will tolerate another interruption—

Mr. LODGE. Gladly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The expression "reservations adopted by the Senate" strikes me as hardly correct, for the reason that the reservations were adopted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LODGE. They were subsequently adopted in the Senate, every one of them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the Senate the Senate rejected the resolution incorporating the reservations, and it puts the matter in an awkward position to go on record here as favoring reservations adopted in the Senate, when as a matter of fact the resolution containing the reservations was defeated, and we have now reconsidered the motion by which that defeat occurred.

Mr. LODGE. The reservations were certainly adopted in the Senate. What was defeated was the resolution of ratification with the reservations appended. There is no doubt that the reservations were adopted. I think the description is an accurate one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, Mr. President, I move, in line 3 of the motion offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, to strike out the words "reservations adopted by the Senate," so that it will simply refer the treaty to the committee with the resolution of ratification.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be a great mistake to adopt that course, and I hope it will not be taken. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to recommit the treaty in this form and report it back to the Senate is for the purpose of voiding the cloture rule. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that if the Senator from Massachusetts insists on his motion and we should order a reporting back of certain reservations which came before the Senate when the treaty was last reported, it puts Members of the Senate on this side of the Chamber in rather an embarrassing attitude in ordering the report of reservations that they did not favor. There is no question that this side of the Chamber desire to take up the treaty. They desire to cooperate with the Senator from Massachusetts in his effort to take it up; but they do not desire to be placed in the position of voting for proposals that they negated by their vote when the matter was in the Senate before. It seems to me that the question of lifting the cloture rule can be done by unanimous consent, and I think an effort ought to be made to void it by unanimous consent before the vote is taken. I rise for the purpose of asking the Chair if the cloture rule heretofore adopted can not be set aside by the unanimous consent of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I ask the Senator in charge of the treaty, before he insists on this motion, at least to give the Senate a chance to void the rule by unanimous consent. If that is done, then the position of the treaty before the Senate now will be exactly where it would be if he sends it back to the Committee on Foreign Relations and then brings it back.

Mr. WATSON. With the reservations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The motion has been reconsidered.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And it will be exactly where it will be if the Senator from Massachusetts brings it back from the committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts. If the sole purpose of the Senator in reconsidering the action of the Senate in rejecting the resolution of ratification which contained the reservations agreed to by the Senate is to get rid of the cloture and bring the matter before the Senate, in view of the fact that the Chair has ruled that unanimous consent can be given to set aside the cloture rule, would it not suit the Senator's purpose, just as well to ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in rejecting the resolution of ratification be reconsidered, and then the resolution stands before the Senate just as it was when it was rejected with the reservations adopted by the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. That is what we have done. We have already reconsidered the vote by which the Senate rejected it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In view of the fact that the Senator from Alabama and the Chair agree that cloture can be dissolved by unanimous consent, and inasmuch as a dissolution of the cloture rule was the sole object of referring the resolution and the treaty to the committee, why does not the Senator from Massachusetts ask unanimous consent that cloture be dissolved?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like, before giving the unanimous consent, to know the precise parliamentary situation in which we are then left.

As I understand it, we have reconsidered the vote by which the motion to reconsider was tabled. Therefore there is now before the Senate the motion to reconsider the vote by which the treaty was rejected. I desire the Chair to correct me if I am misstating the situation as I understand it. That being the case we can go on and reconsider the vote by which the resolution of ratification with reservations was rejected, and then we can proceed to reconsider the vote on each of the reservations, bringing them all severally before the Senate. That is the parliamentary situation, as I understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has the recollection, subject to revision by the RECORD, that what was done was that separate votes were taken in Committee of the Whole on each of the reservations. They were decided and carried by the

Senate by a majority vote, and the rule adopted by the Senate under a rule which the Chair believes to be in direct contravention of the Constitution of the United States, a rule that has led to all this trouble. If each reservation had been adopted by a two-thirds vote there would be no doubt about the final ratification by a two-thirds vote.

Then it passed into the Senate, and some reservations were voted on en bloc and on others there were separate votes.

Mr. LODGE. They all received a vote in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They all received a vote. Then they were included in the resolution of ratification, and that was lost, not receiving the constitutional two-thirds vote of the Senators present. Then the motion was made to reconsider. The Senator from Massachusetts moved to lay the motion on the table, and that prevailed. Now, we have reconsidered the vote whereby the motion to reconsider was laid on the table. That leaves before the Senate the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution of ratification containing the reservations was defeated. If you want it back in Committee of the Whole you must go back step by step and reconsider every vote that was taken until you get back into Committee of the Whole, or it must go to the committee on motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Or we can keep it in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I say if you want to go back to Committee of the Whole you must reconsider each one of these votes.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, may I attempt to correct the Chair's history in one particular? The resolution of ratification with reservations failed, was reconsidered, and again failed. The resolution for unconditional ratification failed, and the motion to reconsider that resolution was laid on the table. Therefore the resolution that will be before the Senate if this motion prevails is not the resolution with reservations but the resolution for unconditional ratification. It seems to me that the only way that this can be untangled is to have it go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and come back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think unquestionably the Senate can do by unanimous consent anything that it can do by a series of votes. It seems to me clear that if the Senator from Massachusetts will ask that the cloture rule be set aside and that all votes that intervened be set aside and the treaty be taken up in Committee of the Whole in the initial stages in which it was originally presented to the Senate, that that can be done by unanimous consent, and by unanimous consent we reach the same conclusion.

Mr. LODGE. That would bring back the treaty as it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with the series of reservations before us as rejected by the Senate and with the whole series of amendments to the treaty. That does not seem to me to be the proper method to dispose of the treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts why the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama would not meet the situation? If the Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all of the votes be reconsidered and that the treaty be taken up and considered as in Committee of the Whole the same as it was when originally reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, would not that meet the situation?

Mr. LODGE. I was just stating the condition it would be in. It would be with all the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole, some 50 in number, and carrying the reservations—15 I think—that were reported from the Committee of the Whole. It would open up the whole debate which arose when it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is the situation which would arise.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I may have misunderstood the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama, but I understood him to say that unanimous consent would do away with all the amendments and that we could consider the treaty as in Committee of the Whole, and in the same condition it was in when it was reported from the Committee of the Whole to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. No unanimous consent to take it back into Committee of the Whole can strip off the action of the committee because that has been done. By unanimous consent you can only undo these parliamentary motions that have been made and either adopt or defeat them; and when you get it back in Committee of the Whole it has the committee amendments and reservations on it. You can by unanimous consent put it back in the Committee on Foreign Relations, of course, if you want to get them off in that way, but where the unanimous consent proposed by the Senator from Alabama would leave it would be

where it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Senate wants to do that, very well.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not understand it quite that way.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from Massachusetts give me his attention while I suggest a substitute for his motion, which I think will put the matter in Committee of the Whole, where it can be handled in accordance with his desire?

I move to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the treaty of peace with Germany, with instructions to report the treaty back immediately without amendment and without reservations.

It will then be in Committee of the Whole, where the Senate can do with it as it pleases.

Mr. LODGE. I think voting it out of Committee of the Whole, of course, commits nobody. Every one of those reservations, of course, must come before the Senate, and the quickest way is to bring them out on the treaty from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was taking the quickest way. It does not commit anybody on either side to the reservations which were voted on. The ratification resolution must come before the Senate and will come before the Senate. All I want to do is to shorten the road, and I shall adhere to my motion in that respect. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he agrees with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] that the resolution of ratification, which was reconsidered and laid on the table, and which we now have taken off the table, was not the resolution of unqualified ratification without any reservations?

Mr. LODGE. I have not looked into that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my recollection; and if that is correct, the motion which I suggest would be the proper course to put it in the committee, where we can agree upon the reservations that we desire to attach to it.

Mr. LODGE. The point of difference is a very simple one. I want to bring the treaty back here with the reservations. If the Senator wants to take it to the committee, the committee can bring it out with the reservations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin is correct, the motion offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] can not be accurate, because it refers to reservations when there were no reservations at all.

Mr. LENROOT. The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts relates to the treaty and not to the reservations; and, of course, it is in order to attach any instructions that we may see fit. It is not the resolution of ratification to which the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts refers but it is to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; but the resolution of ratification having reservations in it was not reconsidered.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We have only voted to reconsider the resolution of ratification that contained no reservations.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I beg the Senator's pardon. The motion to reconsider the resolution to ratify with the reservations was rejected; it was tabled.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suggest that the Senator make his motion merely a general motion to recommit, without any instructions whatever.

Mr. LODGE. I have been trying to explain the situation; but if the Senator thinks it is desirable to send the treaty back to the Committee on Foreign Relations and let them consider it as they did in the original case, I can not object. It will, however, cause delay.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I assume that the committee will report the treaty back with such reservations as the chairman of the committee favors. If the chairman of the committee is in favor of reporting it back with reservations which have heretofore been reported, I assume that it will come back in that form or in such form as will be satisfactory to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. If it is left open to the committee, the committee will bring back such reservations as they determine on. My object, as I have repeated again and again, is to get the subject which we are going to discuss and going to act upon, which is the reservations, as everybody knows, before the Senate as quickly as possible, and I think I have taken the shortest way to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say that, in my opinion, considering the parliamentary situation as it exists, there is nothing inconsistent in the acts of those of us on this side of the Chamber in supporting the motion of the

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It is well understood that the object is to bring the entire subject matter back to the Senate for consideration, and that it is expected that amendments will be offered by the Senator from Massachusetts himself to the reservations that it is contemplated will be reported with the resolution of ratification. In that view of the matter, I think we may very well end this debate and proceed to adopt the motion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have a suggestion to make which I think might meet the approval of the Senator from Massachusetts. Everyone on this side and all of the friends of the treaty on the other side desire that the treaty go back to the Committee on Foreign Relations. They also favor that portion of the resolution which suggests that the treaty be reported back immediately. Some of us upon this side, however, do not feel as if we want to commit ourselves in favor of instructing the committee to report back the reservations. The question is capable of division. Let us vote first upon that part of the resolution that directs that the matter be referred to the committee with instructions to report immediately. Everyone will vote for that. Then let us simply take a viva voce vote upon the other question; that is to say, to return it with the reservations theretofore reported. Why would not that be the shortest way?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can reach his purpose by moving to strike out the words to which he objects.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have already made such a motion; but, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], I am willing to withdraw the motion to amend, and simply ask that the question proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts be divided, so that we may have a straight vote on each clause.

Mr. LODGE. How will the Senator divide it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask, then, that we first vote upon this language:

I move to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the treaty of peace with Germany—

Then second—
together with the reservations adopted by the Senate and the resolution of ratification—

And then finally—
together with the said reservations and the ratifying resolution.

Mr. LODGE. That is not dividing it; that is amending it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I am simply dividing it.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be a great deal better to take a vote on an amendment. The Senator can reach his purpose by an amendment; that is the simplest way. What difference does it make, so long as the Senator gets a separate vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is rather immaterial. I was seeking to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and I thought perhaps it would facilitate matters.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was not quite in accord with my idea. My idea was to have a vote upon the entire resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, except that portion which directs the Foreign Relations Committee to return the reservations; a vote on the entire resolution to refer the whole subject matter, just as the Senator has it, with instructions to report immediately; and then the Senate vote—

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I point out that the danger in that proceeding would be that the controversy will be relegated to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it may continue for many months, whereas it is the purpose of those who are promoting this motion, on both sides of the Chamber, to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate and to settle it as speedily as possible.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am sure that Senators will understand that if the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to report immediately, they can only report the reservations which the Senate acted upon. If the committee is expected to enter into a series of roll calls to modify the reservations that the Senate agreed upon and which were incorporated in the resolution of ratification, it will be an interminable task in the committee. There is no use instructing the committee to report forthwith or immediately, which means right now, or, at the latest; to-morrow morning, unless the Senators expect the committee to report back the reservations, which everybody agrees are going to be the basis of negotiations, with a view of modification. If those reservations, which are known as the Lodge reservations, are reported back here, the proceeding has succeeded in its purpose. We shall have gotten rid of the cloture rule, and both sides, and those who have practically exhausted their time under the cloture rule, will have an opportunity to discuss the modifications proposed. That is what is

coming, anyway. So I do not see any objection to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts as it stands, to report forthwith, with the reservations that were agreed to by the Senate. If it is the wish of the Senate to change those reservations, we can do it when the treaty gets here. It will go to the Committee of the Whole, as I understand, will it not, Mr. President; and in Committee of the Whole amendments as well as reservations will be in order, will they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. So the whole thing comes up de novo before the Senate when it once gets out of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it seems to me that when we all agree as to the exact thing we ought to do, we ought to be able to agree as to how to do it. There is not much use to shy at shadows. As I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts desires to restore the parliamentary status which prevailed when the resolution was perfected in Committee of the Whole and reported to the Senate; and I believe that unanimous consent should be granted to restore that parliamentary status. That, as I understand, is what will be accomplished when the treaty goes to the committee and comes back. I see the point the Senator is trying to arrive at. Senators on this side do not object; they merely object to the method of arriving at it. It seems to me if the Senator would prefer a request to restore that parliamentary situation it might be granted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think the plain and sensible way to reach the object we are all trying to attain is through the motion I have made, which was carefully considered, and I should like a vote on the motion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We withdraw all amendments, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the motion be stated.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Mr. LODGE moves to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the treaty of peace with Germany, together with the reservations adopted by the Senate and the resolution of ratification, with instructions to report the treaty back immediately, together with the said reservations and the ratifying resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate begin the consideration of the calendar at No. 341.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

Mr. NORRIS. I could not hear the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been made.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to begin the consideration of the calendar with Order of Business No. 341.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that where the Senate left off when the calendar was last under consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection.

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects. The first bill on the calendar will be stated.

BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The joint resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in, and an advisory council for, the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Jacob Nice was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) for the selection of a special committee to investigate the administration of the office of the Alien Property Custodian was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that that resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2978) to establish additional fish-cultural subsidiary stations in the State of Michigan was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2773) for the relief of Ethel Proctor was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2785) to provide aid from the United States for the several States in prevention and control of drug addiction and the care and treatment of drug addicts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States negro soldiers at Houston, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that joint resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2672) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1302) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2444) to create the commission on rural and urban home settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) providing that whenever the United States becomes a member of the League of Nations this Government should present to the council or the assembly of the league the state of affairs in Ireland and the right of its people to self-government was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

SUITS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

The bill (S. 2692) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. May we have the bill read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has heretofore been read in full and amended.

Mr. GRONNA. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to explain the bill to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. That is all I ask, to have the bill explained or to have it read.

Mr. OVERMAN. Under the present law if a man in the State of the Senator from North Dakota or any other State wishes to bring suit against the Government on a claim, if the claim involves more than \$10,000, he must come to Washington, employ a lawyer, and try the case here. This bill allows him to try it in his own State if the amount involved is less than \$100,000; that is all the bill does.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator what the amount is now under the present law?

Mr. OVERMAN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. GRONNA. And this makes the limit \$100,000?

Mr. OVERMAN. If the claim involves an amount over \$10,000 the claimant must now come to Washington to try it. This bill increases the amount to \$100,000. Under the law now, I repeat, if a man has a claim for over \$10,000 he has got to come to Washington to bring his suit. This bill provides that if he has a claim as much as \$100,000 he may sue in his own State.

Mr. GRONNA. I withdraw the objection.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHEN A. WINCHELL.

The bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that in the administration of the pension laws Stephen A. Winchell, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and of Second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of Second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, on the 5th day of September, 1865; but that no pay, pension, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISH-CULTURAL SUBSIDIARY STATIONS IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I wish to return to Calendar No. 172, to which the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] objected. He has just informed me that he has no objection to that bill and is willing to withdraw his objection to its consideration; and unless some other Senator objects, I should like to have the bill considered now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$50,000 for the establishment of two or more additional fish-cultural subsidiary stations in the State of Michigan, including the purchase of sites, construction of buildings and equipment at some suitable points to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce, and for the improvement and equipment of

existing subsidiary stations in the State of Michigan; but provides that before any final steps shall be taken for the construction of such stations the State of Michigan, through appropriate legislative action, shall concede to the United States the right to conduct fish hatching and all operations connected therewith in any manner and at any time that the Commissioner of Fisheries of the United States may consider necessary and proper, any fishery laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ETHEL PROCTOR.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] also objected to Calendar No. 196, being the bill (S. 2773) for the relief of Ethel Proctor, when it was reached in regular order. The Senator from Utah has informed me that he will withdraw his objection to that bill, and I ask that the Senate return to it and consider it now.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has heretofore been considered, and the amendment reported by the committee has been agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1233) to repeal an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof, was announced as next in order. The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary adversely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. FRANCE. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3090) to repeal the espionage act was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

FRANCIS M. ATHERTON.

The bill (S. 2614) for the relief of Francis M. Atherton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that in the administration of the pension laws Francis M. Atherton shall hereafter be held and considered to have been mustered into the service of the United States as a member of the First Battery Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery on the 15th day of March, 1862, and to have been honorably discharged from the same on the 1st day of February, 1863, and to have been mustered into the service of the United States as an unassigned recruit on the 19th day of December, 1863, and to have been honorably discharged from the same on the 9th day of March, 1864.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGES IN NAMES OF VESSELS.

The bill (H. R. 3620) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN M. WILLEY.

The bill (S. 2707) for the relief of Ellen M. Willey, widow of Owen S. Willey, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that in the administration of the pension laws the late Owen S. Willey, who served in the United States Navy from July 11, 1860, to April 16, 1863, as an acting master's mate, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the naval service of the United States as an acting master's mate on April 16, 1863, provided that no pay, bounty, pension, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is anyone here who can explain the bill or not. I notice that the report says:

Under date of August 4, 1908, this department certified to the Secretary of the Treasury that the naval service of Mr. Willey was not creditable.

That is all that is stated in the report, and that could mean almost anything. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ISAIAH STEPHENS.

The bill (S. 848) to reimburse Isaiah Stephens, postmaster at McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that go over.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah will refrain from objecting to the consideration of this bill. Does the Senator insist upon his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. From the report I do not see why the Government of the United States should pay this amount of money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the report of the committee, which went into this matter very carefully and very fully, was unanimous to the effect that this man was entitled to this reimbursement. It is a debt that seems to be justly due him. I hope the Senator from Utah will withhold his objection and let the Senate pass upon the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the report made by Mr. J. C. Koons, Acting Postmaster General, I can not see why the Government of the United States should pay this money. The Government was not lax in any way. The loss was entirely due to the carelessness of the postmaster.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I disagree with the Senator entirely about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will read the report, if the Senator wishes, and let the Senate decide about it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I understand, then, the Senator is willing to let the matter come before the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I shall object to the consideration of the bill to-day under the report that has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator is going to object, the bill might as well go over.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then there is no use in discussing it further to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3066) to provide for the incorporation of cooperative associations in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. KING] asked me to request that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ELLIS B. MILLER.

The bill (S. 1661) for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller was announced as next in order.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the report states that—

This measure was considered in the Sixty-fourth Congress—Senate bill S. 7106—and received the favorable recommendation of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps at that time, and the accompanying letter of Brig. Gen. Charles T. Long, United States Marine Corps, dated September 5, 1919, sets forth the facts, and is submitted as a part of this report.

That letter is not in this report; and, unless some Senator can explain it in detail, I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3109) to amend section 26 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1455) for the relief of John L. O'Mara was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2954) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert F. Smith, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3152) for the relief of George W. Mellinger was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Adolph F. Hitchler was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over. We have passed a bill with an amendment or rider to take care of that item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM E. JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of William E. Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to reimburse William E. Johnson, former chief special officer and special disbursing agent, for the expenditure made by him under the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the defense of Juan Cruz, a noncommissioned officer engaged in the suppression of the liquor traffic among Indians, for the payment of which no appropriation was available, there be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,839.95.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARLOW AVELLINA.

The bill (H. R. 5665) for the relief of Carlow Avellina was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE B. GATES.

The resolution (S. Res. 262) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2675) to compensate George B. Gates for the infringement of his letters patent by the United States was considered by the Senate and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2675) entitled "A bill to compensate George B. Gates for the infringement of his letters patent by the United States," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2822) making available additional moneys for the reclamation fund, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, of course I should like very much to see that bill passed, but I know we can not pass it on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and I therefore ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

J. B. WATERMAN.

The bill (S. 2554) for the relief of J. B. Waterman was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not had time to read this report, and I should like the Senator introducing the bill to explain the details of it—whether the Government was at fault or whether the postmaster was at fault.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, this is a very simple case, where a village postmaster in Ohio was robbed of \$483 in stamps belonging to the Government. The only question raised against the bill, and one which the committee thought to be invalid, was a report by one of the post-office inspectors that the safe in which the stamps were deposited was not kept in perfect order; but the testimony adduced in the hearing by affidavits shows that the safe was more difficult to unlock because of its imperfect order than when it might have been in perfect order. Moreover, it is easy to understand that the possessor of a safe in a village finds it very difficult to keep it in such order as would be becoming in the case of a bank in a city, with facilities at hand; and, quite apart from these things, I know from personal knowledge that there are experts who can open any safe that was ever invented. I know that we have an attorney in my home city who can step into any county treasury in the State of Ohio, whenever they find themselves in trouble, and unlock the safe, no matter whether the trouble is because of a lost combination or some mishap to the mechanism of the safe.

So I really think that the Government ought to be considered of this postmaster. I am not saying that this belongs to the legal qualifications of the attorney to whom I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator was.

Mr. HARDING. I am only citing a very well-known fact, that there is no safe that is wholly secure against the operations of burglars. That is well established. There is no question but that the postmaster had been duly diligent in safeguarding the property of the Government, and he ought to be reimbursed for the loss sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is not a word from the Post Office Department in this report. It does not give any details whatever, and I can not understand why such a communication is not incorporated in the report.

Mr. HARDING. If the Senator from Utah will read the report, he will see that there are numerous affidavits on file.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, of course we can get affidavits on almost any question we desire from people who are not interested in the matter; but the Government will have to pay this money if the bill is passed, and we ought to know at least why the Government should pay it.

Mr. HARDING. I am sorry that the Senator from Utah places such a low valuation on the affidavits of my fellow-citizens in Ohio.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not only in Ohio; it is in every State in the Union, as far as affidavits are concerned.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I respect the Senator from Utah very much for his watchfulness, and I hope it will ever continue; but I should think it was attention unnecessarily given to interfere with the Government reimbursing one of its employees who has been robbed under these circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator whether the Government of the United States thinks there was no negligence on the part of this postmaster?

Mr. HARDING. I explained when I first took the floor that the inspector made the report that the safe was not in perfect order, and the Post Office Department for that reason has advised against the payment of the claim; but the affidavits show that the safe in imperfect order was more difficult to open than it was in perfect order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go over to-day, Mr. President.

Mr. HARDING. Do I understand the Senator to object?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DAVIS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (S. 2861) for the relief of the Davis Construction Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask that that bill go over. This is a very just claim. The fact is that this is a claim to itself, as it were. All of the claims of this character for buildings that were erected under the Secretary of the Treasury have been provided for and relief has been given them. This is a case where a small contractor contracted to build a Post Office Department equipment shops buildings, and, owing to the emergencies of the war, he could not get freight by car and had to haul a great deal of the gravel and sand by team. On account of the increased cost of material commandeered by the Government, the cost of this building was such that the principal in this company will have to sell his house if the bill is not passed.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator to state the amount involved?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The amount involved is \$26,000.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will let it go over for this time, I should like to look into it a little further. I am a member of the committee, but I was not present when this bill was reported out.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The bill was unanimously reported; and I think the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], who was one of the Senators present, recognizes that that is the case. It has been put back once; and the home of the president of this company—a small contractor, an honorable man—will have to be sold in order to make up this deficiency unless the bill is passed. I hope the Senator will let it go through. It is perfectly just.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I want to substantiate what the Senator has just said. I went over this matter very carefully, and I consider it a very just claim, and one that ought to be paid.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well; I will withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to receive fully itemized and verified claims and reimburse the Davis Construction Co., contractor for the Post Office Department equipment shops building, erected at Fifth and W Streets NE., Washington, D. C., under the supervision of the Postmaster General, for losses due directly to increased costs due either, first, to increased cost of labor and materials, or, second, to delay on account of the action of the United States Priority Board or other governmental activities, or, third, to commandeering by the United States Government of plants or materials shown to the Secretary of the Treasury to have been sustained by it in the fulfillment of such contract by reason of war conditions alone.

And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to submit from time to time estimates for appropriations to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no claim for such reimbursement shall be paid unless filed with the Treasury Department within three months after the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That in no case shall the contractor be reimbursed to an extent greater than is sufficient to cover its actual increased cost in fulfilling its contract, exclusive of any and all profits to such contractor: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress at the beginning of each session thereof the amount of each expenditure and the facts on which the same is based.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3391) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the sale of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma," approved February 8, 1918 (40 Stat. L., p. 433), was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee is not in the Chamber at this time. I ask that the bill may go over until he returns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

The bill (H. R. 396) to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3477) to increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

The bill (S. 547) authorizing the enlistment of non-English-speaking citizens and aliens was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States," approved August 1, 1894, as provides that "in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who can not speak, read, and write the English language" be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) seeking a convention between the United States and certain Central American countries for the protection of migratory birds was considered by the Senate and agreed to.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3746) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We can not do anything with that bill before 2 o'clock. I therefore ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3747) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We can not dispose of these pension bills before 2 o'clock. That is the reason why I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and to

certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For the same reason, I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that that bill go over for the same reason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3395) to discontinue the improvement to provide a channel extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARRISON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3396) to discontinue the construction of a dry dock at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARRISON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) authorizing the subcommittee on Naval Affairs under resolution No. 62 agreed to June 6, 1919, to employ such counsel and clerical assistants as it may deem necessary was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARRISON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1699.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, earlier in the day, when the treaty was before the Senate, I made a point of order against the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. While the point of order was made and decided by the Chair and on an appeal the Chair was sustained, I was not permitted to make any remarks on the subject. I desire to take this occasion to put some matter into the RECORD, for any student who may in the future want to know what the parliamentary situation was, and so that he may realize what kind of a rape the Senate of the United States committed on general parliamentary law, if he wants to find it. I know, of course, that it will have no effect upon the Senate, but there may be a time when some one will want to write a history that is truthful upon just what occurred.

The Senator from Massachusetts moved to suspend a certain rule, the first paragraph of Rule XIII, which relates to the reconsideration of motions. That motion prevailed, and hence the rule was suspended. That means that as far as the first paragraph of Rule XIII is concerned it was just the same as though the Senate had never adopted such a rule, and hence we were considering the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to reconsider the treaty the same as though we had no rule on the subject.

In that case, Mr. President, no one will deny that the general parliamentary law applies, and I want to insert in the RECORD now, and I defy anyone with any authority to contradict it, that under general parliamentary law, without any rule whatever by the body, it is not in order to reconsider any proposition the second time. Neither is it in order to make a motion to reconsider, under the general parliamentary law, after the time has elapsed that has elapsed since the treaty was disposed of last November.

First, I wish to call attention to the RECORD. The treaty was voted on upon the 19th day of November, 1919. On that same day a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the resolution of ratification was rejected. That motion prevailed. It was reconsidered and then acted on again, and on the same day, and defeated again. So that one motion to reconsider had been made and under general parliamentary law, as I shall show by the highest authority in the world, that absolutely disposed of it for all time. It was dead, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] publicly said, after we had disposed of it; and there was not any way to get it here again unless the President of the United States resubmitted it, which I concede he had a right to do at any time.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad the Senator from Nebraska has placed these facts in the RECORD. My recollection with

reference to what transpired in the Senate is exactly as the Senator has outlined it. If the Senator will permit me, I want to say that although I might have been in favor of voting for the general proposition, which I was not, I would not violate the rules of the Senate and vote in support of the motion which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made this morning, knowing as I did that it was not in order.

Mr. NORRIS. On the 19th day of November, the day we disposed of the motion to reconsider and disposed of the treaty, the session of Congress adjourned without day. That was not this session; it was a preceding session. We adjourned without day. From the 19th day of November, 1919, when that session had passed out of existence—not only the Senate but the entire Congress—nothing, of course, was done until to-day.

Let me say that the proposition in parliamentary law to reconsider a motion is an American proposition. It does not exist in England. It never existed before America developed it. It was born in America. It has grown up in parliamentary bodies in the United States until the law particularly on this point is well recognized and well known, but we can get no precedent going back of America, because the motion to reconsider originated in America.

One of the greatest authorities on parliamentary law, recognized by all students of the subject, is Cushing. I desire to read from section 1264 of Mr. Cushing's Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wonder if my colleague, who lays such emphasis upon the fact that Congress adjourned sine die in November last, has had in mind Rule XXXVII, subdivision 2 of which reads as follows:

Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or any subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted.

Mr. NORRIS. I am acquainted with that rule, and I am also acquainted with the rule which provides that any bill pending at a session of Congress can be taken up at the next session of the same Congress. I mentioned the fact as to a motion to reconsider made at one session principally to emphasize the time that has elapsed, and I am going to show by the authorities that one week would have been enough, that one day would have been enough, to exclude it. The rule the Senator has read has nothing whatever to do with the question of reconsideration. If the treaty had not been finally acted on last session of Congress and had only been disposed of to-day or yesterday, then the rule he has read would apply. It is like a bill disposed of last session. It would be too late now to reconsider it. Our rule which we suspended provides that it must be on the same day or on either of the two succeeding legislative days, but under general parliamentary law we could not go even that far. So when we suspended the rule we got into another rule of general parliamentary law that was more drastic than the one we suspended.

1264. The inconvenience—

Mr. Cushing says—

sometimes resulting from the practical application of the rule above stated—

He has been discussing the motion to rescind before the motion to reconsider had been discovered in parliamentary law. The only method they had to take up a question that had once been decided was to rescind the motion by which the previous action had been taken, and Mr. Cushing was discussing that:

The inconvenience sometimes resulting from the practical application of the rule above stated has led to the introduction into the parliamentary practice of this country of the motion for reconsideration, which, while it recognizes and upholds the rule in its ancient strictness, yet allows a deliberative assembly for sufficient reasons to relieve itself from the embarrassment which might attend the strict enforcement of the rule in a particular case—

That is the rule to rescind to which he is referring—

so that it has now come to be a common practice in all our legislative and other deliberative assemblies, and may consequently be regarded as a principle of the common parliamentary law of this country, to reconsider a vote already passed, whether affirmatively or negatively.

In the note he says:

This motion, though parliamentary in its character, is entirely American in its origin, and one of the few motions known only in our legislative assemblies. The nearest approximation to it that I can find in the proceedings of the House of Commons is contained in the ninth volume of the journals of that body, and inserted in the note to paragraph 1257. Neither does it depend for its existence on the rules and orders of any assembly in which it prevails, though it is commonly regulated by them—

As it is in the Senate by the rule which we suspended.

It appears to have been in frequent use in the Congress of the Confederation, though it is not mentioned in the rules and orders of that body; and it was in common use in the House of Representatives of the United States before any rules on that subject were adopted.

In section 1273 Mr. Cushing, going on with the discussion, says what I shall read. I am omitting that part of it which has no reference to motions to reconsider, but he is considering the principle involved in the rule and has enumerated several of them, all of which would be interesting, but they do not have any bearing on the particular point raised by my point of order. In section 1273 Mr. Cushing said:

The third effect of this principle is—

I want the Senate to note this—

that when one motion to reconsider has been made and decided, either in the affirmative or negative, or is still pending, no other motion to reconsider the same question is admissible; but if the question since its first reconsideration has been so altered by amendments as to be no longer the same, it may again be reconsidered.

In other words, if you will follow out the reasoning and follow the reasoning of Mr. Cushing in it, you will find that unless that rule be adopted, then a motion to reconsider is simply a means by which endless discussion and endless consideration may be given to any proposition; there is no end to it. So without regard to our rule that we have had in the Senate which we suspended, under general parliamentary law when a question has once been reconsidered it can not be again reconsidered. So on that point my point of order was good. Now I will take up another one, as to time.

One of the points I am making is that from November 19, 1919, until now, with one session adjourned and Congress adjourning from day to day, it is absolutely contrary to parliamentary law that the motion should now be made. I want to read from Robert's Rules of Order, another well-recognized American authority. The subject is "Reconsider," and section 27, on page 73, reads as follows:

It is in order at any time, even when another member has the floor, or while the assembly is voting on the motion to adjourn, during the day on which a motion has been acted upon, or the next succeeding day, to move to "reconsider the vote" and have such motion "entered on the record," but it can not be considered while another question is before the assembly.

So that under general parliamentary law as laid down by Robert, bearing out entirely what Cushing says, and which I might also cite if I wanted to take the time, the general parliamentary law is, as I said, more strict than even the rule of the Senate which we suspended and which provides that this motion can be made on one of the two succeeding days. Robert says that it must be made on the same day the motion you want to consider was acted on or the next day. You can enter the motion even while they are voting on a motion to adjourn; that is, you could not consider it then, but you could enter the motion. The motion once entered can be considered after the lapse of that time.

On the other point I made awhile ago, let me read what Robert said on that, on page 74:

No question can be twice reconsidered unless it was amended after its first reconsideration.

There you are again. We have now reconsidered this proposition twice without any change after months and months and months have expired.

As I said at the beginning, I simply wanted to get this into the permanent RECORD of the Senate, so that it might be known by those who take the pains to look at it in the future that this was laid before the Senate and that notwithstanding the fact that it suspended this rule, the Senate absolutely violated a rule that controlled the Senate after that suspension took place. That is so plain that no man can misconstrue it. It is a rule that has no exception, a rule that has never before been denied by any legislative body in the United States.

Mr. President, if this were the end of it I would not care so much about it, but we are living now in a time when we are complaining of the disregard of law and of rules. We are living now in a time when of all other times we ought to be circumspect in our conduct and in our obedience to law and to order. To have the Senate give to the world an illustration of nullification of a plain parliamentary law that they have promised to uphold and sustain is simply to give encouragement in this day of wild speculation and wild reasoning to those who want to violate other laws and those who want to overthrow all law. It is to give encouragement to every Bolshevik, every revolutionist, and he will be able to point to the Senate of the United States and say there is a precedent where Senators even violated their own law in absolute defiance of all law and without the opportunity of any man on that floor being allowed at the time to raise his voice in criticism of such conduct.

You have the votes. I do not care much about the result. But, Mr. President, it is the exercise of a power that is bound to bring fruit in the end that will be damaging, perhaps not to us but to our children.

Let me read what George Washington said about things of that kind. I have read it before, but I want to read it again,

Even though the Senator says in his own conscience we violated the law, but we did it for a good purpose, even though he is so wrapped up in the sacredness of the treaty and thinks it is going to bring so much good to humanity—I think he is wrong about that, but I concede his right to feel that way, and he excuses his conduct on the proposition that the end justifies the means—you establish a precedent. The whole civilization of the world has been built up on precedent. You establish a precedent in high places, and then you put the screws of the law on the poor devil who violates a law not half as sacred probably as the one that you thrust aside in trying to bring about what you consider the proper course to take. It is a usurpation of authority, Mr. President. George Washington said:

But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Thus, Mr. President, calling attention in better language than I can to the fact that we have to-day established a precedent that will give a good excuse for many an anarchist and many a revolutionist and many a Bolshevik to follow his illegal and inhuman conduct and take the law into his own hands; in other words, if the Senate of the United States does not respect law, how can we expect the ordinary citizen to do so?

MILITARY VERSUS REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the first war against militarism was won by our boys in France last year. The second war against militarism in our country is about to be fought out in the United States Congress.

The introduction of the Army reorganization bill of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] makes the issue quite clear. The question is, Shall America be ruled by a military oligarchy more powerful, more expensive, more subversive of freedom than the German military oligarchy ever was? Or shall we continue to be ruled under our Constitution by the representatives of a democratic people? The issue is unmistakable. The lines are clearly drawn. The fight is on.

If the Congress passes the Wadsworth Army reorganization bill, militarism of the German type will have removed its abiding place from the land of the Hohenzollerns to a home in the United States, formerly and still proudly called "the land of the free and the home of the brave," and our participation in the German war will have been in vain. If the bill is defeated, militarism must only be a specter for a long time, because no nation on earth has the means now to resuscitate it except the United States.

It appears to be the common belief that all the Wadsworth bill does is to establish universal compulsory military training. While this is done, there are many other provisions of the bill, like giving the Chief of Staff war powers, abolition of the various State National Guards, giving the Chief of Staff power to build up a civilian organization, and fixing an enormous increase in expenditures for the War Department, any one of which largely overshadows the important matter of compulsory service or conscription. Virtually every provision of this remarkable bill is a blow aimed at peace and liberty. However, at this time I shall only deal with the universal compulsory service or conscription in time of peace.

REENACTMENT OF CONSCRIPTION LAW.

Section 51 of the Wadsworth bill, reported favorably by a majority of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, provides:

All male citizens of the United States (excluding residents of Alaska and the insular possessions) and all male persons who reside therein and who have declared their intention to become citizens, other than persons excepted by this act, shall, upon attaining the age of 18 years, or within three years thereafter, be subject to military or naval training, and shall be inducted into the Army or Navy of the United States for this purpose alone, and shall be subject to training therein for a period of four months and for such further time, not exceeding 10 days, as may be reasonably necessary for enrollment, mobilization, and demobilization.

Section 57 of the bill makes the provision of the conscription act of May 18, 1917, "relative to the registration, examination, classification, exception, exemption, and induction into the service," applicable to this act. All of the great, expensive machinery of the conscription act which was brought into being by the war and used in that war is again brought into force.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. When I get through I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator, if he will wait for just a few moments.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is thus seen that under the terms of this bill the conscription law made necessary by the war with Germany, which act was repealed by the act of June 15, 1917, so as to cease to have effect four months after the close of the

war, or after our forces were brought home, is reenacted as a permanent peace policy. We actually provided for the repeal of the conscription act at almost the beginning of the war—and less than one month after the passage of the conscription law—and yet more than a year after the war is over it is proposed by the majority to reenact it.

It is estimated that about 1,000,000 young men arrive at the age of 18 years every year, who will be affected by this act. All of the local and district boards created under the act, and all of the expensive machinery, and all of the penalties created by the original draft act will be continued should the proposed bill become the law.

I do not favor this provision for compulsory universal military training, and my reasons may be stated under three general heads, as follows:

NEITHER A WISE NOR AN AMERICAN POLICY.

I believe that the passage of such a bill would not be a wise military policy for the United States. Such a policy is in opposition to the traditions and to the history of our country. It is in opposition to the habits and to the customs of our people. It is not necessary to our national safety. It may be subversive of our democratic institutions. Since the birth of our Nation we have been engaged in six great wars. We have come out victorious in every one of them. Our armies have never been defeated. Our people are unaccustomed to militarism as a peace policy. It is contrary to the genius and happiness of our people to be under military domination. It is contrary to our well-defined views as to personal liberty and to freedom of conduct to be constantly under the supervision of military officials. Nor is it necessary to our national safety. We can never be in any immediate danger. I am not one of those who do not believe in military preparedness. I believe in military preparedness. I believe in having a Navy as large as that of England or any other nation—large enough to protect our shores from any enemy that may seek to invade them. I believe in having a well-balanced and an effective Army, that can be easily made larger, and I believe in having always such military-training schools in our country as will give us the first order of military officers whenever they are needed, and I believe in having well-organized National Guards in each State; but with two great oceans standing between us and any enemy that is likely to invade us, surely it is not necessary for our perfect defense to have the largest military force ever established in all the earth always in readiness.

Then, on the question of policy, the institution of universal military training, carrying with it the immense central military organization that will be necessary to the fulfillment of such a scheme, would be dangerous to our civil institutions. If kept up it would be just a question of time when the military authorities in this country would be supreme. One or two more foreign wars would turn us from a Republic into a military oligarchy. I am satisfied with the Constitution and the Government of the United States as they are. I do not wish to see them changed into a military oligarchy or to any other kind of government.

UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY TRAINING REQUIRES GIANT MILITARY ORGANIZATION NECESSARY.

It must be plain to every student of the subject that in order to train a million men a year in an army that is yearly increasing by nearly that number more that the central military organization must be increased enormously. We must have a vast increase in the General Staff, a vast increase in general officers—Regular and Reserve—a vast increase of equipment and material, a vast increase in the number of camps and Army posts. In other words, it will be necessary to have the full quota of officers for an army of 1,000,000 men now and for 5,000,000 men within seven or eight years, and it will be necessary to have a full equipment for an army of this enormous number of men ready for war at any time.

Should this be established the dangers to our Republic would be enormous. No Congress would be independent of the will of this great centralized and highly organized force. No President would be unmindful of the power and influence of such a mighty military organization. No court would willingly offend such a power. The General Staff would soon become more powerful than all the present departments of government combined. The result must inevitably be a military oligarchy.

It was this kind of military oligarchy, but on a smaller scale, that the United States undertook to crush when she went to war with Germany. It was this kind of a military oligarchy that the free sons of America did crush in that war, for whatever attempts may be made to muddle the matter, the plain fact of the German war is that the hitherto untrained troops of America were better fighters and did overcome the troops of Germany,

which has had a system of compulsory training for over 100 years.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, of course.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Do I understand the Senator to take the position that the universal military service provided in the bill which he is discussing is compulsory service?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do; and, of course, when the bill is read there can not possibly be any difference of opinion on that subject, because the provisions of the draft act are reestablished in the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does the Senator believe that under the provisions of the bill those who come under it are subject to duty except when the President shall declare an emergency to exist?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are subject to call for duty when they become 18 years of age and at any time before reaching 21.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not wish to delay the Senator, but as I understand the bill it provides simply for the training of young men for four months during their eighteenth year, and they are not subject to compulsory service unless there is an emergency and unless they are called. They are not part of the organization of the Army of the United States, and therefore, while the bill provides for compulsory training, it does not provide for compulsory service. The Senator has not noted the distinction.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will examine the bill, he will find that he is wholly in error about it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I read for the information of the Senator from page 76, which provides that—

The organized reserves—

And those in training are a part of the reserves—

shall be liable to call for military services of the President only when Congress shall declare that a national emergency exists.

Mr. McKELLAR. That does not at all contradict the position that I take in regard to the matter.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NEW. I was interested in what the Senator said a moment ago when he expressed the belief, as I understood him, that we must have an army capable of rapid expansion. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recollect having used any such words.

Mr. NEW. I understood the Senator to say that we should have a force that could be mobilized quickly and largely expanded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think if the Senator will wait and hear what I have to say he will be in a better position to interrupt me in regard to the matters concerning which we differ. I do not think the Senator was present during all of my remarks, or, if so, he did not catch exactly what I said; I am quite sure he did not.

Mr. NEW. I have been present, and I thought I understood the Senator to the effect I have indicated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator misunderstood me on that proposition.

In going to war—and I am talking about the German war—Congress promised the people of the United States that by the sacrifice of their sons and by the contribution of their wealth and of their services, that German militarism would be destroyed forever, and that when the war was over the armies of the United States would be disbanded and those that composed such armies would go back to the peaceful pursuits of life and that the military armaments of the world would be reduced. We did not promise that we would crush German militarism in Germany and then fasten the same kind of militarism, except a larger one, upon the people of the United States. I believe that if the people of the United States had dreamed that this would be done, they would have never permitted Congress to have gone into this war.

THE COST PROHIBITIVE.

But regardless of the merits of compulsory training, it is absolutely impossible—and I want Senators to listen carefully to this—for the United States to stand the gigantic cost of the bill as proposed.

The bill provides on its face in terms for 15,293 officers and 280,000 enlisted men. Generally speaking, a fair estimate of average cost of officers is \$4,000 a year per officer. This would

make \$61,172,000 cost of officers. The estimated cost of the enlisted man is \$1,800 each per year. By a simple calculation this would amount to \$504,000,000. The combined cost would be \$565,172,000. This is exclusive of officers of the Medical Corps, chaplains, professors, and warrant officers—whatever they may be; I believe they are noncommissioned officers or selected men to whom it is desired to give the salary of commissioned officers or something approximating such salary—in all amounting to about 3,000, and which will increase these figures about \$12,000,000 more.

The President nominally, but the Chief of Staff, specifically, has the right under the terms of the bill to increase the Army 20 per cent. If this is done, this would make \$98,971,000 more, or a total of \$605,826,000. This does not include the additional cost which would ensue if he added 20 per cent to the most expensive arm, the Artillery, and reduced the most inexpensive arm, the Infantry. By thus proceeding such action would increase the Army cost by approximately \$206,913,000 instead of \$98,971,000. To this must be added the cost of training 1,000,000 young men four months in the year. Assuming that you could train them as economically as you could keep men in the Army, and it is very doubtful whether it could be done as cheaply, this would amount to \$600 per man per year, being one-third of \$1,800, and would add \$600,000,000 for the Regular Army, and it would give a grand total of \$1,276,143,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sure the Senator wants to be accurate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure not only that I want to be accurate, but that I am very accurate. I will say to the Senator that I have taken the pains to present these figures to military authorities than whom I consider there are none better, and I am speaking upon military authority when I make these statements about the figures.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to state that if the Senator will read the hearings of the committee I think he will find that the committee and the subcommittee, taking nearly a year in the preparation of this bill, had before them the experts not only of the financial division of the War Department but of all of the branches, and that the best estimate and the maximum estimate which was made for the cost of the establishment as provided in this bill was between \$450,000,000 and \$500,000,000, and not six hundred and fifty-odd millions, as the Senator stated. Also the estimate of the number of men to be trained annually under the universal system of training was 600,000, and not a million men.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment and I will yield. All I can say in answer to that, in the first place, is that any testimony to the effect that there are not a million young men or a little more than a million young men becoming 18 years of age every year is based on ignorance of the figures given by the census. In the next place, I want to say that any person—I do not care who he is—that has made an estimate of the cost of this bill at \$600,000,000, including the expenses of the Regular Army, has not come within 50 per cent of the mark.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from New Jersey to say that the estimate, according to the subcommittee's witnesses, was about \$450,000,000?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Between \$450,000,000 and \$500,000,000 for the present establishment provided in this bill, outside of the universal military training. That was estimated for the first year at \$134,000,000, and \$94,000,000 three years afterwards. The maximum was \$136,000,000 and the minimum \$94,000,000, and by reason of the universal military training system devised in this bill we eventually expect to save on the cost of our Regular Army Establishment.

Mr. BORAH. What I was going to say was that if the estimate is \$450,000,000, judging the future by the past \$750,000,000 would be a very reasonable amount at which to fix the actual expense which will be attached to the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the committee were faithful to their duties, because I know that the chairman and others have given very careful study to the question. Basing it upon the present cost, and making allowances for all the underestimates of the past, I think they made a fairer calculation than the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BORAH. I was not referring to the committee's work. I am referring now to what the Senator says was the estimate of

these authorities. He may travel through the estimates which have been made before Congress for the last 10 years, and he will find that the estimates generally are about 50 per cent of the actual expense.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. These estimates were based upon the calculation of the committee of the present cost of the service, and not entirely upon the estimates made by the War Department and the other departments relating to this subject heretofore. I want to say, further, that the committee have labored earnestly to give the Senate in this bill not only their best efforts but a very complete study of the whole situation, and not try to fool or lead the Senate into error in regard to the cost. The committee realize that the great question before the country at the present time is the cost of our Military and Naval Establishment. They realize that in this democracy we must bring the cost of our national defense to the lowest possible figure; but they also realize that it is necessary, in order to maintain our dignity and honor, to maintain an Army sufficient to protect this great population of 110,000,000 people.

The Senator from Tennessee probably wants to wipe out the Army. I do not know. I do not know what he proposes. He was not present at the hearings of this committee, although a member of the Military Affairs Committee; and now he is attacking—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just one moment. I want to say that I do not think matters that were brought up before the committee ought to be introduced into the debate on the floor of the Senate; and there was a very good reason why I was not before the committee. The investigation was conducted by a subcommittee, and I was not invited, and of course—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not wish to be discourteous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee further yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, wait one moment. I decline to yield to the Senator any further. His manner is such that I do not want to yield further at this time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to continue for a few moments. Then I will take great pleasure in yielding to the Senator from Utah, or any other Senator who desires courteously to interrupt me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield, and will proceed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, continuing, to this enormous sum, \$605,000,000, the cost of the Regular Establishment, must be added the cost of training 1,000,000 young men four months in the year. Assuming that you could train them as economically as you could keep men in the Army, and it is very doubtful whether it could be done as cheaply, this would amount to \$600 per man per year, being one-third of \$1,800, and would add \$600,000,000 for the Regular Army, and it would give a grand total of \$1,276,143,000.

I must stop here long enough to remark that it is stated that we pay these boys a little less when we are training them, and we do under this proposal; but that expense is largely increased by the overhead charges for just four months in the year. Of course, we know that the overhead charge will be relatively larger for training men four months in the year than for training them the whole year, and we have to take that into consideration when we measure the cost of the men who are thus trained. I give these figures without fear of successful contradiction, because they have not only been given by Army authorities but they are according to the experience of our country. You can take any Army bill for the last eight years, since I have been here, and any Army appropriation bill that has been passed by Congress will absolutely guarantee the correctness of the figures that I have given.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Just for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield to the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator's manner is wholly improper, according to my judgment, and I decline to yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a point of order. I should like to have the Senator explain what there is about my

manner, or anything I have said, which is in any way discourteous to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If there is anything of the kind, I most certainly wish to disclaim it. I have no desire to have any personal feeling between the Senator and myself. I simply wanted to have the truth brought out in this debate, and I want to ask the Senator a question, and I appeal to him to allow me to interrupt him at the present time.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from New Jersey will ask a courteous question I shall be delighted to yield to him; but unless it is so I shall certainly decline.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I always try to be as courteous as I can, and the Senator has failed to point out where I have been discourteous. I should like to have him do it. I should like to ask the Senator what his authority is for the figures which he is stating.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have figures here from officers who have gone over them carefully and who are very much more familiar with them than I am.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What Army officers?

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to give the names of the officers. The Senator will find them in the published hearings. Why should I name certain officers when the Senator will find them in the hearings before the Senator's own subcommittee? The War Department is in favor of this bill, and it would not be fair to Army officers opposed to the bill for me to give their names. There are plenty of them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee further yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does the Senator state that some of the officers whose names appear in the hearings before the committee have given him these figures?

Mr. McKELLAR. Some of them have, and the Senator misunderstands and misconstrues and misinterprets the testimony of the officers who have testified before the committee. The facts do not warrant the conclusion reached or suggested in the questions submitted by the Senator.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the Senator object to giving the names of the officers who appeared at the hearing who are authority for the statements the Senator makes?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will let the Senator examine the hearings for himself. I am perfectly willing that he should examine the record.

This will give a grand total of \$1,276,143,000 for the Army when universal training goes into effect. To this must be added at least one-half of the cost of the Air Service, or \$50,000,000, if the Air Service bill should pass, and the majority reported it out at one time. It is true that they withdrew it; but if it passes we will have to add \$50,000,000 more to that, which will amount to \$1,326,143,100 for the Army next year.

The assertion that we can have compulsory training under the bill for \$143,000,000 or \$150,000,000 a year is an idle dream. I will say to the Senate that you not only could not have compulsory training for \$150,000,000, but you could not get the necessary officers to train the men, with the necessary materials, with the necessary Army posts; you could not furnish those things for the \$150,000,000 a year. It is going to cost, just as we know that it has always cost, so much on the average per man whenever you put a man into the Army for training or any other purpose. It is going to cost you about \$1,800, reckoned by the year. Four months is one-third of a year, and it is going to cost not less than \$600 for four months' training, and probably a great deal more when the time comes.

If the bill should be enacted into law, instead of costing something like a half million dollars, as has been suggested here on the floor to-day, it will cost nearer \$1,500,000,000 when we come to pay for it. It may not be that we will appropriate for it in the Army appropriation bill, but we will have to pass deficiency bills, as we have been doing for years, to make up the deficit that must come.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. NEW. The Senator says that in case the bill for a separate department of air shall eventually become a law that will add \$50,000,000 to the expense of the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that the estimate was \$98,000,000.

Mr. NEW. If the rest of the figures that have been given to the Senator are as unreliable as those that he now quotes with reference to the Air Service, I am afraid that he is, to say the least, inaccurate.

Mr. McKELLAR. They could not be very much more inaccurate than the Senator's own bill, because the Senator had so little confidence in his own air bill that he withdrew its consideration from the Senate the other day before a vote came; and I imagine that the Senator's figures must have been a little inaccurate, or he would have gone ahead and tried to put his bill over.

Mr. NEW. So far as that goes, the bill for the separate department of air was not withdrawn for any such reason as the Senator from Tennessee ascribes.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think it was withdrawn because the Senator realized that the Senate would not pass it. It was an immense increase in the expenditures of the Government, which can not be justified at this time. We will have to raise the taxes on the people if we continue to pile these immense appropriations upon the people of this country, and I think that is why it was withdrawn.

Mr. NEW and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in the first place, I still contend that the bill creating a department of air would have worked a very substantial reduction in the expenses of the Government for the Air Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Maybe that is why the Senator had so much trouble with his bill. He proved to the Senate that it would work a reduction in expenditures, and perhaps the Senate did not believe in a reduction of expenditures, and for that reason did not pass his bill.

Mr. NEW. Well, that may be possible; but what I rose to ask was, if the Senator from Tennessee leaves the Army without an air service—

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am very much in favor of an air service.

Mr. NEW. The Senator does not wait until I ask my question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NEW. I was going to add, if he leaves the Army without an air service unless the bill for the department of air is passed, as I understand, he simply leaves the Army without any estimate for air service and adds on \$50,000,000 to the expenses in case the department of air bill is passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we would have to add on more than that if we have a separate department of air—very much more than that. However, that is a mere guess. The Senator will remember that we appropriated some six hundred and odd million dollars for the Air Service the first year of the war, and perhaps a billion the next year, and there are not many of us that know where that money ever went. The people of this country do not know where it went. So far as I am concerned, I am very much in favor of an air service; but I am unwilling, for my part, to vote another dollar for the Air Service unless we know that we are going to have aircraft and fliers.

Mr. NEW. I not only admit that we spent \$640,000,000 for air service the first year, but I will assert that we spent twice that sum.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we spent a billion dollars the next year and got no service.

Mr. NEW. What I want to know is if the Senator makes no charge for the maintenance of an air service for the Army unless we are to have a separate department of air? He makes no estimate for it in the figures that he is giving us, but just says that he will add on \$50,000,000 in case the department-of-air bill passes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will wipe out his air service entirely, we will have a billion and one-quarter dollars appropriation for the next appropriation bill if this bill is passed. If the bill should be enacted into law, as I said, it will cost nearer one and one-half billion dollars than it would half a billion dollars. The actual cost is always greater than the estimate.

When we compare this gigantic sum—and I hope Senators will listen to this—for the entire military system with our compulsory military training in peace times, we can get some idea of what we propose to do under the Wadsworth universal-training bill. In round numbers Germany spent in 1907 for her entire military appropriation—universal training and all—\$200,000,000. In 1908 she spent a like sum of \$200,000,000; in 1909 also \$200,000,000; and in 1910 and 1911 \$200,000,000 each. In 1912 she spent \$230,000,000, and in 1913, while preparing for war, she spent \$360,000,000.

The very year the war began she had authorized an expenditure of but \$210,000,000.

It is thus seen that we are going to expend for our Army during the ensuing year, if the bill passes, a sum more than

four times as large as Germany ever spent in peace times for her great military system and more than seven times as much as she ever spent in any year of peace except that one when she was preparing for war. In other words, we will have, in order to establish this military system in this country, a system seven times as expensive as the German military autocracy had, and yet we fought the German war to strike down German militarism!

If this proposed military system is put in force, in 12 years it will cost more than the United States has paid out for the German war. Exclusive of what we loaned the Allies, the war has cost us about \$18,000,000,000, according to some estimates. Our Army alone will cost this sum in just 12 years. It is the most ambitiously audacious and expensive military proposal in all history.

This expenditure, in face of the fact that we have 4,000,000 young men well trained and ready for service upon 10 days' notice, is, to my mind, the most monstrous proposition that was ever put before the American people. If they are willing for such a proposition at this time to go through, P. T. Barnum must have been right when he said that the American people loved to be humbugged, and I might add they loved to be taxed. Income and excess-profits taxes must be increased in order to pay the cost or bonds must be issued. I challenge the Republican majority, for they are responsible for legislation, to put this increased burden upon the American people. I challenge our Republican friends to put a demand for peace-time conscription in their platform to be made next June. I will also wager any of my Democratic brethren who differ with me on the proposal that it will never go into the San Francisco platform.

AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSED TO MILITARISM.

I believe in thus voicing opposition to this gigantic military scheme I am in accord with the views entertained by the great body of the farmers of the country, who furnish in the persons of their sons the greatest number of soldiers for such an army. Their production will be cut down; their boys will become dissatisfied.

I believe I am in accord with the great body of laboring men, whose sons furnish the next largest quota of men for such an army; and also with the business world, whose business would be greatly hampered and interfered with by the compulsory taking away of such a large portion of their employees; and, again, with the educational world, the schools and colleges of the country, whose students will be taken by force at the most important stage of their school or college life; and, again, with the great body of our boys who have just completed a splendid service for their country in the European war.

Indeed, in my judgment, this bill, while I am sure not so intended, constitutes a direct slap at our splendid boys who won the late war. Never was a duty more nobly performed than they performed theirs. We asked them to destroy German militarism. They did it. We promised them to make our country safe from the militarism which they destroyed. Instead of fulfilling our promise to them the majority now propose to set up in our own country an even worse and vastly more expensive militarism than that which they destroyed and seven times as expensive and very much larger than any German militarism that ever existed.

We have discharged them from the Army without doing anything substantial for them. We have paid them little. We have promised them much by way of bills and have given them little by way of acts. I think we ought to do something substantial for these boys who have already done so much for our country before we embark on this wild orgy of expenditure for a future army of American militarism. We should pay our just debts to the Army just demobilized before we undertake to create a new army, to which as yet we owe nothing and so far as any man can now see we have no need for. To be perfectly frank, I shall vote for no large army and no large scheme of military training until the boys who won the late war with Germany have been properly paid. Instead of spending \$1,300,000,000 for a new army this year, I would much prefer to spend not exceeding \$300,000,000 on our present Army, and in some proper way devote a reasonable portion of this difference of a billion dollars to our soldiers who won this great war.

I am not unmindful of the fact that one of the great post-war organizations has passed a resolution favoring compulsory universal military training. I have the greatest respect for the views of that excellent organization, but I do not believe that resolution reflects the majority views of the great body of the soldiers who took part in that war, though it may reflect the views of a majority of the officers. I believe the enlisted men of the war are more generally opposed to conscription in times of peace than are the officers.

I believe I voice the views of all those who favor our National Guard system, indissolubly connected with our military system

by our Constitution itself and by the desires of our people in all the years since the Constitution was formed. The various State National Guards did the most excellent service during the late war. No body of our troops behaved more splendidly. We should build up their organizations instead of pulling them down.

The Wadsworth bill should be defeated. No amendment of it can make it an American bill. We have an excellent law now. It is known as the Army reorganization act of 1916. That gives us an American military system. Under such a system we won the greatest of all wars. Under it we defeated the trained armies of Germany, trained under universal compulsory military training laws. Our troops won because they had in the highest degree a spirit to fight, a spirit that can not be built up under a military autocracy, and can only live under a democracy. Let us not crush out this American spirit to fight. Let us keep it as one of our most precious heritages, for our experience shows that we can never know when we may need it.

Let us have an Army sufficient for our needs. Let us have a splendid National Guard in each State. Let us build up a system of military training in our schools and colleges, so that we may always have a reserve of well-trained officers, and let us keep a Navy ever ready equal to that of any nation. Let us make our Regular Army a great vocational training institution, turning out and graduating 100,000 well-educated and well-trained young men every year, after a three years' course; let us make the educational and vocational advantages in the Regular Army, now already begun, so attractive to young men that there will be a waiting list to get in the Army instead of the present difficulty in getting recruits; but we should never establish a military oligarchy or autocracy in this country. We should never turn our country into an armed camp. We should never jeopardize our free institutions by raising, during the time of excitement caused by the winning of a great foreign war, the graven image of the time-despised, cruel, false, and imperious god of war, which has caused the downfall of so many great nations in the years that have gone by. Under our historically democratic military system we have never known defeat. Shall we exchange this uniformly successful system for a system of military despotism that has never in all the history of the world known a permanent success? To me such an exchange by us is inconceivable.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was very much interested in the suggestion the Senator made a moment ago as to what sort of a Regular Army we should have and what it should be used for. As I understood him, he suggested in the latter part of his remarks that the Regular Army should be used as a great vocational training school, with which I am in entire accord; but the Senator further suggests that from that Regular Army there should be graduated 100,000 men a year, each man having served three years. That means at least a Regular Army of 300,000 men, does it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It does.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At \$1,800 per year per man in cost, there is \$540,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator a little earlier in his speech stated that he was in favor of no appropriation larger than \$300,000,000 a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that we have a Regular Army now authorized, and which is to be reduced to 225,000 men after July 1 next, as I understand it. The Senator knows it is almost impossible to get these young men to enlist in the Army voluntarily. We have great difficulty in recruiting for the service. Why? Because Army life is not attractive to the vigorous, splendid young men of America. They can make more money, they can do better, they can prosper more in the various walks of life in times of peace.

In order to have an Army we have to make it attractive to the young men, and we could not spend our money better than to make a great educational institution of the Regular Army. If we could arrange it so that we could take recruits into that Army, keep it filled at 300,000 men at a cost of \$500,000,000, if you please, I think it would be vastly to the interest of the United States to do it, and I believe that we would build up a stronger body of military men than we can by giving every young man four months of military training when he becomes 18 years of age, a little dab of military training that would not amount to a row of pins after four or five years. What you want to do is not only to give him a military training but to educate him and fit him for life, and let him go out afterward and be equal to the other young men of the country who are otherwise well educated. As the Senator knows, in the last appropriation act we provided not a very large sum, a rather

moderate sum, to begin vocational training in the Army. I very gladly voted for it. I would be delighted to increase the amount a great deal more this year. It is our duty to increase the amount. We ought to educate these young men, and if we are going to have a Regular Army at all we must offer them some encouragement in order to secure their services.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was not arguing the merits of vocational training in the Army. I am heartily in favor of it. I merely ask the Senator which figure he now adheres to? In one portion of his speech he announced that he thinks the appropriation for the support of the Regular Army should not exceed \$300,000,000 this year. Then he announces at the end of his speech that he is in favor of a Regular Army of 300,000 men, which, on his figure of \$1,800 per year per man, makes \$540,000,000. Which is it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Though apparently that is a discrepancy, really it is not so, if the Senator will examine in the Record what I have actually said. I said that this year I thought we could reduce the amount for our Regular Army to \$300,000,000 and use the difference between what I believe the Senator proposes to appropriate, about \$1,300,000,000—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Use a reasonable proportion of the difference to pay these boys what we owe them. We have been promising these boys for a long time, and we have not performed at all. I have seen no bill from the committee authorizing the payment of a proper sum to the young men who won the war. I think we ought to pay them back before we start on this gigantic scheme of militarism in this country.

As I said, it seems to me \$300,000,000 is enough for this year. We ought to have an army costing about that—an army of 180,000 men—and I think that would be ample for this year. We have right now 4,000,000 young men well trained whom we can get on 30 days' notice if we need them. Why should we embark on this enormous expenditure for training other young men when we have 4,000,000 men already trained in the country right now, and trained at an enormous cost to the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator's comparison of figures is very interesting. At a later time I shall endeavor to give the correct estimate. As I understand it, after this year perhaps the Senator would advocate the maintenance of a regular army of 300,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I see no objection to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At \$1,800 per man per year?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that unquestionably we can not expect prices to always remain like they are. The Senator knows that about six years ago it took about \$1,100, maybe about \$1,000, to maintain a man. Seven or eight years ago, when I first came to Congress, I think we estimated it at \$900 per year per man. It is the increase in the cost of living and in general prices that has carried the cost of the Army up. I think we could have and ought to have 300,000 men in the Army for a very much less sum than half a billion dollars.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator admits that we can not have them at present prices. I assume his estimates are all based on present prices?

Mr. McKELLAR. They are all based on present prices.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Evidently the Senator is willing to vote this year for the amount necessary to support a Regular Army of 300,000 men at a cost of \$540,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Provided—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Provided what?

Mr. McKELLAR. Provided those men are given a good education while in the Army, where they could graduate and go out in the business world; and I venture the prediction right now that the business men of the country would vie with each other in endeavoring to get the young men trained in such a way with such a splendid physical and mental training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not arguing that question. I am heartily in favor of it. The Senator's estimate is \$1,800 per man per year, and that includes vocational training?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wish to ask the Senator if, having committed himself to a \$540,000,000 Army, how much is he going to allow the National Guard besides?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not figured the amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought the Senator had not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to do with the National Guard what is right. We have been exceedingly liberal with the National Guard all over our country, and we were ever

since the act of 1916. We have built them up. The provisions as to the National Guard are so involved that it is difficult to estimate about them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At what cost?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember the figures, but I am perfectly willing to go on like we have been doing and continue to build them up.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me interject with this suggestion—

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it is necessary this year, because, as I said, we have 4,000,000 young men upon whom we can put our fingers in 10 days or in 30 days at the outside.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not speaking about this year. I am taking the Senator's own suggestion that we will let this year go by, and after this year goes by we will have a Regular Army that will cost \$540,000,000 a year on the basis of present prices. I ask the Senator how much more than that are we to spend for the National Guard? Apparently the Senator has made no estimate of that. Let me say to the Senator that the National Guard, under the national-defense act, was authorized at a maximum strength of 425,000 men. I would not contend that it could reach that strength—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I have not the figures before me, but the most that we ever got up to until the war, it seems to me, was 60,000 or 70,000; it may be that it ran up to 100,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is exceedingly inaccurate in his figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We had 130,000 men in the National Guard at the time of the Mexican border service.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was because of threatened war with Mexico. Up until the time of threatened war—

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is a little off in his figures, as he himself has admitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator has the figures on the National Guard for 1912 and 1913, will he give them to us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not them on my desk, but I will guarantee they are over 100,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department estimates that it will cost on the average \$400 a year to support a soldier of the National Guard; that is, through Federal assistance. We will say that the National Guard is no larger than it was in 1916—100,000 men. That is \$40,000,000; and that is a very low estimate in strength a year from now. We will add that to \$540,000,000, that the Senator has already said he is willing to stand for, and we shall have a sum of money which is greater than this bill will cost.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not agree with the Senator at all. I do not believe this bill can possibly be put into force entirely, as I shall attempt to point out later on, for less than \$1,325,000,000 or \$1,326,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the Senator estimated for the National Guard in the estimates he has given the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have not; but that would add that much more.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I see the Senator has been very thorough.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am thorough enough for this: I think I understand the difficulties in the way of the Senator's bill. The Senator was not kind enough to put me on the subcommittee which had the arrangement of the hearings on these matters—at which I do not complain—and, therefore, my exact information as to what occurred in the committee is not as good as that of some other Senators who were on the subcommittee; but, I take it, that we all know what the Senator's bill contains; we can read his bill; we know what it calls for; and we all know from actual appropriations and from deficiency bills how much it takes to pay an officer and to keep an enlisted man in the Army.

Does the Senator desire to interrupt further, or does any other Senator desire to interrupt? If so, I will yield now.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask a question either of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] or of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. McKELLAR. If I think the Senator from New York can answer the question better than I can, I shall turn it over to him.

Mr. BORAH. What are the provisions of the bill so far as military trials and courts-martial proceedings, and so forth, are concerned relative to the boys who may be in training in the camps under the universal-training provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are no specific provisions in the bill covering courts-martial.

Mr. BORAH. Then I take it that there are no provisions which except them from the operation of the ordinary rules of courts-martial proceedings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; there are not.

Mr. BORAH. Then, they would come under the ordinary rules of procedure?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They would come under the Articles of War.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will call the Senator's attention to this provision of the bill which may cover the matter. I do not know, but I will examine it and see. It reads:

SEC. 57. THE EXISTING LAW MADE APPLICABLE.—In order to carry out the provisions of this act relative to the registration, examination, classification, exception, exemption, and induction into the service of persons liable for the military training provided for in this act, so much of the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," as may be necessary and applicable thereto are hereby extended and made applicable for this purpose.

That clause might not be sufficient to include them; but the very fact that by section 51 they are inducted into the Army makes it absolutely certain that they will have to stand court-martial just as any other boys in the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no question about that. The Articles of War, of course, apply.

Mr. McKELLAR. I take it that there can not be any question about that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now desire to take the time of the Senate for just a moment. It so happens that I have a detailed estimate before me prepared after weeks of effort by the War Department, in this instance by Gen. Lord, of the Department of Finance. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee has great confidence in Gen. Lord. This statement gives in itemized form the items of cost of the training for four months of 100,000 men. I think I will read it. It will not take very long.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator reads the statement, I should like to say that while I have great confidence in Gen. Lord, I have always found this about officers in the War Department—and it applies to most of them, indeed, I presume it applies to most men, for that matter—that when it comes to figures and they are figuring on something of which they approve, the figures are very favorable, and when they are figuring on propositions to which they are opposed, the figures are usually found unfavorable; but the fact is that we here in the Senate always have to check them up by deficiency bills, and oftentimes our deficiency bills for the War Department have been almost as large as are the regular appropriation bills. I make no charges against any officers, but we all know that figures are oftentimes confusing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In spite of the Senator's indictment of the figures before he hears them, I am going to read them. This is the cost of training 100,000 men for four months. First, the cost of transportation to and from the places of training, at an average round-trip journey of 572 miles, at 3½ cents per mile, for the 100,000 men, \$2,002,000. Certainly the Senator would not say that 572 miles was an underestimate of the average round-trip journey that every young man should take. That is a maximum.

Per diem allowance for subsistence in getting to and returning from the place of training, two days, at \$2.25 per day, for 100,000 men, \$450,000.

Cost of subsistence while undergoing training, 100,000 men, \$6,360,000.

Cost of clothing while undergoing training, \$2,855,385; cost of laundry while undergoing training, \$400,000; medical attention, including dental treatment, \$766,667; allowance of \$5 per month for four months for each of the 100,000 men, \$2,000,000; family allowance, estimated at \$30 per month for four months for 10,000 men—that is, one-tenth of the entire number was estimated here to have dependents, a most generous estimate for men of 18 years of age—\$1,200,000.

Expense of local boards, not less than three members each, to receive pay not exceeding \$10 per day—the bill provides for only \$5 per day—not exceeding \$10 per day and per member for services and reimbursement of expenses, \$553,500.

Clerical help, office rent, and maintenance, \$384,375; appeal boards, estimated at 50 boards, 3 members each, 30 days, at \$10 per member, \$45,000; clerical help in connection with the appeal boards, \$31,250; the boards themselves, two reports, at \$2 per man for 100,000 men, \$200,000.

Quarters, heat, and light—that is, in the camps—\$1,013,374.

Equipment—that is, the rifles, the cartridge belts, and various other equipment other than clothing—\$7,900,667.

The total for 100,000 men is \$26,162,218.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, except for a difference in the salary paid, what differences will the Senator suggest between the cost of inducting and training a young man into the Army and the cost of keeping a volunteer or a conscripted man in the Army? I am not concerned about figures, but, so far as I can see, the only difference—and it must be apparent to anybody—in the actual cost is a little difference in salary. If there are any other differences, will the Senator point them out? What are the differences?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the difference in salary is very large. The lowest pay in the Army is \$30 a month. The pay under the Army reorganization bill for men undergoing training is \$5 a month, which represents one-sixth of the lowest pay of the Army. The pay of the Army runs all the way from \$30 a month to \$12,000 a year. None of these men are going to get anything like that pay, and, of course, the saving is a great deal more therefore than five-sixths, infinitely more, in the matter of pay alone. In another direction the overhead is infinitely smaller.

Mr. McKELLAR. Proportionately, how could the overhead possibly be smaller for training a man four months than it could for training him a year month after month?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Because for that work we use the Regular Army officers, who are already on the rolls.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill provides for a tremendous increase in the number of Army officers, in some cases as high as 300 per cent in certain classes. I have not the figures before me on my desk at this time. In a subsequent speech I am going to point out the enormous increase in officers provided for in order to carry out this unparalleled scheme of military training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will indulge me a moment further, I venture to say that when we come to the actual payment we are going to find that it will cost proportionately more to train a young man for four months than it will to train him for a year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator has said that a good many times; he may be right; but I should be exceedingly gratified if the Senator would put into the RECORD the itemized estimates which he has in mind and also state to the Senate where he got them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be glad to put in exactly the cost, as shown by appropriations we have provided to support the soldiers. I shall not put in the RECORD any names of Army officers from whom I have received figures in view of the attitude of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff on this bill. The Senator would not expect me to do it under these circumstances, and, of course, I can not do it.

HOUSING CORPORATION.

Mr. STERLING obtained the floor.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. STERLING. I will yield to the Senator if he will state the purpose of the interruption.

Mr. FERNALD. The purpose of my interruption at this time is this: Every time we consider the calendar we lack about a dozen bills of reaching a very important measure to which I think there is no objection on either side of the Chamber. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 358, being Senate bill 3738, abolishing the United States Housing Corporation. I think there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator can give any assurance that it will lead to no extended discussion, I will yield in order that the Senator may have the bill considered.

Mr. FERNALD. I do not think there is any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the pending measure, the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill named by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3738) abolishing the United States Housing Corporation and other agencies and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell or otherwise dispose of property acquired or constructed pursuant to the power and authority granted by the act of Congress entitled

"An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the bill. I think a quorum should be here when it is being considered, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McNary	Sheppard
Beckham	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegge	Henderson	New	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Trammell
Fernald	King	Phelan	Underwood
France	Lenroot	Phipps	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	McCormick	Poinexter	Watson
Gore	McCumber	Pomeroy	Wolcott
Gronna	McKellar	Robinson	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, as the title would indicate, is to abolish the United States Housing Corporation.

Early in 1918 an appropriation of \$100,000,000 was made to establish and inaugurate an agency to build housing for people who were engaged in war work, in the building of ships and the manufacture of munitions of war. Forty-three projects were started, and most of them completed, in the country. The corporation now are endeavoring to sell that property in the many States where it is located. It is expected that they will be able to turn back to the Government about \$72,000,000. This bill proposes to turn all of the business, which naturally now is of a clerical nature, over to the Treasury Department, and in doing this they are now selling this property. Three projects have already been sold complete, and it is thought by the corporation that having some definite legislation to determine when this business shall be turned over to the Treasury Department might hasten the process and aid them in disposing of the property.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FERNALD. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Did I understand the Senator to say that at the winding up of the business of the corporation they will be able to turn back to the Treasury \$72,000,000?

Mr. FERNALD. That is the estimated amount.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, the loss is \$28,000,000?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. When the last appropriation was asked for by the Housing Corporation hearings were had upon the matter before the Appropriations Committee, and at that time I understood that the estimated loss of the Housing Corporation at its final wind-up would be about \$22,000,000. That has now increased to \$28,000,000?

Mr. FERNALD. About \$28,000,000; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator where he got his estimate of \$28,000,000?

Mr. FERNALD. I got it from the Housing Corporation. This is their estimate.

Mr. SMOOT. They gave the committee that estimate?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes. They estimate that they will return to the Government, after deducting for all of the war losses on account of excess cost of construction, the abandonment of uncompleted contracts, the return of building materials, the cost of the Homes Registration Service, and general overhead, the sum of \$72,995,000. These assets are as follows:

Completed houses and dormitories	\$27,436,000
Loans to transportation companies	6,307,000
Transportation property owned	152,000
Loans to municipalities and utility companies	1,600,000
Salvaged furniture and building material	2,800,000
Cash on hand to be returned to United States Treasury	2,200,000
	40,495,000

Cash returned to the United States Treasury	32,500,000
---	------------

Total amount estimated to be returned to United States Treasury	72,995,000
---	------------

Mr. SMOOT. Those are estimates?

Mr. FERNALD. Those are estimates. Of course it is impossible to tell the exact amount, because this property is now being sold, and it is not possible to tell just what it will bring. Three projects have been sold already, and they are very rapidly closing out the balance. This matter has been gone over very thoroughly with the Treasury Department, and it seemed necessary to turn it over to some one of the departments; and as the business is naturally of a clerical nature, collecting rents and handling money, that seemed to be the proper department.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection at all to turning it over to the Treasury Department. I will ask the Senator if his committee asked the Treasury Department as to the advisability of turning it over to that department?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; and I had a representative from the Treasury Department with me in working out the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. In the hearings was anything developed by way of testimony that would show that now was the best time to sell these buildings or whether some time should be allowed for their disposition in the future?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; we went through that subject very thoroughly. We had real estate men from different cities before the committee, and almost every witness testified that this was the best time to dispose of this property; that it ought to be done in the next few months. They are getting very good prices, as the Senator will see. The loss of \$28,000,000 is not a large amount, considering the circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if the estimates are correct and the results tally with the estimates I shall be very well satisfied with the undertaking. I remember that at the time the bill was passed I expressed the opinion that there would be a loss of 33½ per cent. If we get back \$72,000,000 instead of \$67,000,000 it will be better than I anticipated when the bill passed, but, of course, these are only estimates, and we can not tell what the wind-up will be.

Mr. FERNALD. It is not possible to tell exactly. The estimates on what they have to sell are based upon the returns for what they have sold.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that when the last appropriations were asked for the Appropriations Committee were of the opinion that there ought to be a winding up of the affairs of the corporation as quickly as possible, and the House went so far as to compel the Housing Corporation to dispose of the property within a certain time. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, however, thought that would be an unwise thing to do, because if the purchasers knew that the property had to be sold by a certain date no doubt it would have an influence in "bearing" the price at which the property would be sold through bidding by interested parties.

Mr. FERNALD. I want to say to the Senator that that is the precise reason why we determined that the affairs of the corporation should be wound up by June 30 instead of immediately, to give them a few months to advertise the property and to cast about for customers, which they are doing.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not had time to read the bill in full. Do I understand that the bill provides that all of the buildings of the Housing Corporation shall be sold by June 30, 1920?

Mr. FERNALD. No; it is left entirely with the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, the bill provides that by that time all of these things shall be turned over to the Treasury Department, and they shall handle them in the same way, together with the funds that the corporation may have on hand.

Mr. FERNALD. Exactly; all the notes, and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. And whatever obligations the Housing Corporation is under at that time the Treasury Department will assume and carry on the business?

Mr. FERNALD. Precisely, with the exception of three projects which this bill transfers to the Navy Department. They are buildings that were built on the property of the Navy, and it was thought best by the Housing Corporation and by the Navy Department and by the Treasury Department that those three particular projects should be turned over to the Navy Department, which is done by the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that those houses which were on the Navy property are to be turned over to the Navy Department, with a view to disposing of them?

Mr. FERNALD. No.

Mr. SMOOT. Or to hold?

Mr. FERNALD. To hold for their use.

Mr. SMOOT. Were they built for that purpose?

Mr. FERNALD. No; they were not built for that purpose. They were built in connection with work that was going on for the Navy, but they were built by the Housing Corporation.

The land, however, is owned by the Navy, and is in close proximity to the work carried on by the Navy.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, instead of the Navy Department coming to Congress for an appropriation to build those houses, it secured the consent of the Housing Corporation to build them, knowing full well that at the end they would get the houses, because of the fact that they were built on Government land?

Mr. FERNALD. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that is a very good way of doing.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, what becomes of the property where the working girls' dormitories are located?

Mr. FERNALD. That property is turned over to the Treasury Department.

Mr. OVERMAN. Is that to be sold?

Mr. FERNALD. It is not to be sold unless it seems wise to sell it. It was the opinion of the committee that these dormitories ought to be operated for some time to come yet.

Mr. OVERMAN. Who is to operate them, and how?

Mr. FERNALD. They are to be operated under the Treasury Department. The Housing Corporation will operate them until the 30th of June, and then the Treasury Department. They must be operated by somebody.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KING. Was the Senator entirely accurate when he stated that all of the buildings that are to be turned over to the Navy Department were constructed upon land which belonged to the Government and which was controlled by the Navy Department? I find in line 15, page 6, words which would seem to negative that suggestion. The language is as follows:

The land located near the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton, Wash., with the improvements thereon, consisting of a hotel and apartment house, together with the land purchased by the United States Housing Corporation adjoining the said hotel.

Mr. FERNALD. I am glad the Senator called attention to that. I want to say that in that particular case the water that is used by the Navy comes from the spring where these buildings are built; and I think in that instance the Navy Department did not own the land, but they owned the spring and have for many years controlled the water there for their use.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, then we are turning over to the Navy Department now hotels and apartment houses and other property that have been constructed by the Housing Corporation?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that is wise and proper?

Mr. FERNALD. I thought it was, for I believe the Navy Department are now using that hotel. It is used for that purpose.

Mr. KING. By whom, and for what purpose?

Mr. FERNALD. By the Navy Department.

Mr. KING. For what purpose?

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know for what purpose. They have a great many men there, and I do not know just what those men are doing.

Mr. KING. Does the Navy Department furnish houses for those who are working in the navy yards?

Mr. FERNALD. I think they do, in many cases.

Mr. KING. I did not understand that that was the policy of the Government. I can readily see that if we furnish houses for the civilian employees in the navy yards in any part of our naval service the demand will soon be made that we furnish housing facilities for all employees in all navy yards and for all employees in the arsenals and powder factories and wherever the Government is engaged in any operations.

Mr. FERNALD. The Navy Department erected a good many houses, and in this instance section 5 authorizes the transfer to the Secretary of the Navy of houses, dormitories, and the schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Indianhead, Md.; the houses and schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Charleston, W. Va.; and the land located near the Puget Sound Navy Yard, at Bremerton, Wash. That is the property on which is located the spring which furnishes the water for the other houses that are used by the naval officers and the employees.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a further inquiry?

Mr. FERNALD. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Did the Senator consider what the effect will be if we now furnish houses in one navy yard upon the morale of the employees in other navy yards? Does not the Senator realize that if we do that the demand inevitably will follow that we supply housing facilities for all employees of the Government?

Mr. FERNALD. I assume that it is very necessary, in many instances where the Navy are carrying out operations of differ-

ent kinds, to have buildings. They have already constructed them in many instances, and this item would save the Government just about that much, because they have to have these buildings. They are using them now, and I think the buildings are practically filled with men who are working in the navy yards.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that in Seattle we had a navy yard before the war, and the activities of the yard were as great or substantially as great as they will be in the future. I repeat that if we inaugurate now in one yard the policy of furnishing houses for the civilian employees we will have demands to furnish houses in every yard; and if we furnish houses for the civilian employees in the navy yards we will be compelled to furnish houses for the civilian employees in the arsenals and in all of the agencies of the War Department, and finally all those who work for the Government. I do not see where we are going to draw the line. I respectfully submit to the Senator that I think he has made a mistake, and that his committee have made a mistake, in legalizing this proposition that the Federal Government shall embark upon the plan of furnishing houses to those who work for it. I do not know where it is going to end. Unless there is a fuller explanation furnished with respect to this provision I shall ask the Senator to modify it or consent to an amendment; and I shall offer an amendment to strike out this section and ask that all of the houses referred to in the section shall be treated as the other houses owned by the Housing Corporation, namely, sold by the corporation, and if not then turned over to the Treasury Department to be sold at the earliest possible date.

Mr. FERNALD. I should like to read to the Senator the statement of Admiral Coontz, of the United States Navy. The chairman asked this question:

The immediate matter that I understand the Secretary of the Navy wishes brought before this committee is the amendment offered to section 2 of the bill, reading as follows:

"The following property shall be exempted from the provisions of this section and shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy, together with any unexpended balances of appropriations made for the maintenance thereof by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 19, 1919, which balances shall be accounted for and audited as Navy funds:

"Houses, dormitories, and schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Indianhead, Md.; houses and schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Charleston, W. Va.; hotel and apartment house adjoining the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton, Wash.; together with the land purchased by the Housing Corporation adjoining the said hotel and that upon which said apartment house is erected."

Now, Admiral, we will be glad to listen to you.

Admiral Coontz. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1917, about the time the war broke out, there were at Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash., which is adjacent to the city of Bremerton, if I recall, 1,180 employees.

As the war went on, that number increased to about 6,800, and is now, I believe, about, roughly, 6,000.

At the same time it became necessary to build a camp there to handle our enlisted force up to, say, 7,000 men; and we handled all sorts of officers, as we averaged about one ship to France every five days, with either four or munitions, or sent it to Chile for nitrate; and it became necessary to find housing for these people. Bremerton was a small city; it is 15 miles from Seattle, and we had to have a ferry service.

In the course of time the Housing Corporation built some 250 houses on various lots purchased contiguous to the navy yard and also a hotel and an apartment house.

In order to get the land for the hotel and to make it convenient for the employees, they asked to place it on certain lots which the Navy owned in the city of Bremerton, and which were right across the street from the navy yard. Those were composed, I believe, of 14 lots. Seven of them were on one side of Park Avenue and seven on the other.

In order to get the land large enough for this hotel—I happened to be commandant of the district out there at that time—I appeared before the city council of the city of Bremerton and they condemned this Park Avenue, which was a very nice street, and gave it, I believe, completely to the Government.

They also gave us the right to run a tunnel under what is known as Burwell Avenue, in order that the navy-yard employees might get out quickly during their lunch hour, or at any time, to this hotel, and get their lunch and come back. This was done by the city of Bremerton.

Since then they have paved the street, I believe, over the tunnel. In order to have a little extra land around the hotel the Housing Corporation bought two lots on Burwell Avenue and three lots on Fourth Street.

The hotel, as is shown by this blue print [indicating], is on the original Navy land, and on that given by the city of Bremerton to the Government. This hotel is occupied now entirely by men and women who are employed in the navy yard. When I was out there two or three months ago with the fleet there were 40 women in the house, and my recollection is there were anywhere from 300 to 700 men that had rooms.

In addition the United States Housing Corporation acquired some land further back in the city on which they built an apartment house, and rent small apartments to the employees of the navy yard and of the Government.

They also built, as I stated, 250 houses, but they do not come into this question.

The reason the Navy owned this land on which the hotel was built is because of a spring on the land, and because they wanted the spring right so that this water would always be under our control. It comes down into a big reservoir in the navy yard, and several times during the last few years, when the other water there has failed, the fact that we had three days' supply from that spring tided us over some very

serious situations. I understand that situation is now about to be remedied by the Bremerton Water Co.

What we desire to ask is that that hotel built on the Navy land be transferred to the Navy Department, and the apartment house; this for the reason that it will be of great advantage, we believe, to the Navy and to the Government, and stabilize rent conditions in that part of the world, and keep them down to normal.

The hotel, which is known now as Navy Yard Hotel, is run by persons, as I understand it, who have leased it from the United States Housing Corporation. The apartment house is run by the Housing Corporation itself. We would expect to turn steady sums of money into the Treasury from those two buildings, as far as my knowledge goes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are speaking of the navy yard at Puget Sound. Do you know anything of the other propositions?

Admiral COONTZ. No, sir; Admiral Earle will handle those.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any opposition to this amendment from any source?

Admiral COONTZ. None whatever.

From the testimony given by Admiral Coontz it will be seen that if these buildings were not turned over to the Navy Department they would have to be salvaged. They are now used and filled with people who are working in the navy yard, and it seems to me to be much better judgment to turn them over than it would be to salvage them for a very small amount and then be compelled to build other buildings to accommodate these men in the Navy. I think it is a very wise proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator if they are rented to these employees?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; they are rented.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the hotel is rented?

Mr. FERNALD. The hotel is run by somebody who charges rent and turns it back to the Government.

I wish to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] that they do not get free rental there. They have to pay for it. I do not see how the Government would get much of anything out of it if it undertook to sell it, because the buildings would have to be torn down in this particular case, and in the other two cases, where they are turned over to the Navy Department, the houses and buildings are on land owned by the Navy Department.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator why that property was not turned over to the Treasury Department, if they are going to run the housing proposition? Why was it not turned over to the Treasury Department instead of the Navy Department?

Mr. FERNALD. For the reason that the Navy was on the ground and operating the housing.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the Housing Corporation—and I am quite sure that is the case, because it so developed before the Committee on Appropriations—made a lease of the hotel at Bremerton to some private parties, and they are running the hotel. It seems to me that if the Housing Corporation is going out of existence it would be very much better to turn it back to the department of the Government that is going to operate the houses that were built by the Housing Corporation. Why should the Navy have this property turned over to them and the Navy rent the building? If any department of the Government is to rent it, it ought to be the Treasury Department, and then let the money go back into the Treasury of the United States. It seems to me that would be the proper thing to do.

Mr. FERNALD. The Navy Department is constructing buildings almost every year in all their different activities, and it seemed to be proper to turn this property over to the department that was using it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Navy Department is certainly not erecting buildings to rent, and this is a building that happened to be built by the Housing Corporation upon Government land. That land ought to be held by the Treasury Department, just the same as all the post offices of the Government are held, just the same as all houses that the Government owns are held, and not allow the Navy Department to come into the question of holding titles for the Government for property of the United States and make leases in behalf of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FERNALD. Will the Senator permit me to read what Admiral Earle had to say on the other two projects?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. FERNALD (reading)—

TESTIMONY OF REAR ADMIRAL RALPH EARLE, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral, which particular project do you wish to speak of?

Admiral EARLE. I wish to speak of the projects at Indianhead, Md., and South Charleston, W. Va.

The CHAIRMAN. Only these two projects?

Admiral EARLE. Only these two projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; proceed.

Admiral EARLE. The project at Indianhead was initiated in much the same manner as were all the housing projects; that is, because the need for housing of employees during the war was far and away greater than the possibility of housing them. The United States Housing Corporation very kindly helped the Navy out, and these two places especially. The only land available at Indianhead and at South Charleston, W. Va., was land owned by the Government.

At Indianhead the Housing Corporation erected 100 houses and 3 dormitories and 1 schoolhouse, all of a very substantial and very nice character, that would attract the leading men in the employ of the Navy in the manufacture of powder and the testing of guns at Indianhead.

The CHAIRMAN. You expect to continue operations, do you, right along there?

Admiral EARLE. These operations will continue during the time of peace. The powder factory manufactures the powder that we use each year for target practice, and also the powder that is needed for vessels under construction.

The proving ground, of course, goes on actively all the time, testing all ordnance material of every description. These houses and this schoolhouse will be needed constantly. The schoolhouse particularly is of very great help to the people living at Indianhead. In fact, until this schoolhouse was built we had practically no way of educating the children of the employees, and now that is on a very good basis.

At South Charleston, W. Va., we are erecting the Navy's armor plant, the projectile plant being already in operation at that place.

The United States Housing Corporation has erected 65 houses and 1 schoolhouse for the same purpose; that is, to take care of the leading employees, make them satisfied with conditions, and thus insure that we have contented employees and employees of a good class.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERNALD. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do I understand that the Navy Department is operating schools for the children of employees and paying the teachers, and so forth, out of funds appropriated by the Government? It is a great surprise to me if such is the case. We are supposed to tax every State for funds for schooling purposes. Now, in addition to that, does the Senator tell me that the Government is running a school in the Navy Department, and is there any more reason for conducting a school by the Navy Department than there is for conducting a school by the Interior Department?

Mr. FERNALD. In the building of these projects all over the country by the Housing Corporation they did erect schoolhouses. They erected entertainment halls.

Mr. McCUMBER. They are running theaters as well as schools for the employees?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; and they erected garages.

Mr. McCUMBER. And motion pictures?

Mr. FERNALD. I suspect they have moving-picture shows.

Mr. McCUMBER. All to be run at the expense of the Government and for the amusement of the people who are employed?

Mr. FERNALD. I am afraid that is the case sometimes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does not the Senator think it is about time for us to get back to normal conditions and quit this extravagance?

Mr. FERNALD. I think it is. This is the first bill I know of that has been introduced to get back to normal conditions. We appropriated last year \$2,060,970 to carry on this proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. But is it getting back to normal if the bill allows schools to be conducted by the Navy Department, as well as theaters and hotels?

Mr. FERNALD. I know in this project in Washington they have an entertainment hall. I do not know how the money is raised, whether by the people who live in the buildings or how it is done.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator another question right here, because he has been on the committee that has been investigating this housing proposition. If the reports which come to me are not true they are certainly of a very slanderous nature. For instance, in the operation of all these buildings around the Capitol Grounds, that are rented to girls and where the Government is conducting a boarding house, charging them the usual price probably that is charged elsewhere in the city for room and board, I am informed that the Government is losing enough to board as many more.

Mr. FERNALD. That is not true, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to know whether it is true or not.

Mr. FERNALD. I think I can give the Senator the exact amount.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is estimated to me that the actual loss in running the dormitories over here, when you take into account the overhead expenses which are not charged at all to them but are paid directly by the Government, amounts to three hundred and forty-odd dollars per head. If it is not true I should like to have that matter cleared up.

Mr. FERNALD. The exact cost of boarding the girls, provided we charge interest at the rate of 5 per cent on one-half the expense of constructing the buildings and one-half the expense of the furnishings, would be \$50.50 per month. The Housing Corporation charged the girls \$45 per month.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why does the Senator take one-half of the expense of the buildings? If you put up a building that costs \$100,000, why have you not got \$100,000 invested, and why not take 10 per cent or 25 per cent as well as 50 per cent?

Mr. FERNALD. To be exceedingly fair, I thought I would make as good a showing as I could for the Housing Corporation,

for the reason that if the buildings were salvaged they would not bring 50 per cent of their cost. We have these buildings, and if they were salvaged they would bring much less than 50 per cent of their cost, and the furnishings would bring much less than 50 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, the point I want to get at is as to the success of the Government in running boarding houses.

Mr. FERNALD. I think the Government ought to go out of the business as soon as it reasonably can; but so long as we are bringing people in here at the rate of 1,700 per month and there is not room to house and board girls or anybody else, we must do something. I want to wind up the affairs of all these agencies that were established. The bill is in the line of economy, and it is the first one, so far as I know, to wind up the affairs of any war agency.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me to come right back to the first proposition, taking these buildings at just what they cost, not what you can sell them for, but what they cost the Government, allowing 6 per cent, allowing for depreciation, allowing the ordinary overhead charges—because now all the clerical service is paid directly by the United States—I want to know whether the Government is not actually losing over \$300 per head for each person who is being boarded there, notwithstanding the fact that they are charged the same price that they would pay elsewhere in the city?

Mr. FERNALD. I think that amount is too large. I want to read just the exact amount:

The Government dormitories at Washington show expenditures, including accounts payable December 31, in excess of receipts in the sum of \$18,624.24. The disbursements, however, include \$44,712 worth of current supplies on hand as of December 31. The operating profit is therefore \$26,087.76. An estimate for the deficiency appropriation for the fiscal year will be submitted in the usual way.

According to the figures, and we made a penny-wise examination of the accounts, it is shown that there is a little profit without charging any interest or any depreciation.

Mr. SMOOT. Or any overhead?

Mr. FERNALD. Or any overhead; that is, with the exception of the management and the officers.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, they could show a balance that would be very favorable if they did not charge anything but the real expenses of operating the buildings. They are free from taxes because they are on Government land, and at least you ought to figure 6 per cent, for there are no taxes upon the value of the buildings. Then there ought to be a charge for depreciation. Then there are all the expenses for the several hundred or thousand of clerks who have to look after the houses. That is not charged up in your bill to the expense of running the houses. When you deduct those charges I think you will find that you will get right back to a place where the rumor is about correct that we are losing about \$300 per head for boarding those girls.

Mr. FERNALD. I still think the estimate is pretty large, but much that the Senator says is true. We make no account for depreciation or for interest or for overhead of the United States Housing Corporation, which I am seeking to abolish and do away with.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would have been very much better satisfied with the bill if the committee had provided for the sale of every one of the houses. That is what ought to be done. They should have sold the hotel at Bremerton. It would be there for the employees of the Navy Department to live in just the same as it is now. The houses adjoining one of the other navy yards will be there, but the Government ought to sell those houses now. They are in good shape and will bring more money to-day than at any other time; and then, of course, it would be doing just what the Senator, I believe, would like to see the Government of the United States going out of the housing business entirely.

Mr. FERNALD. Every kind of business they have ever undertaken has been a failure.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] spoke of schools. We have theaters right here in the post-office building in Washington. Space there has been turned over for a theater and shows are held there every Saturday night, and I understand sometimes during the week. It seems to me that ought to come to an end before very long. The space that is being held there for the theater can be used to good advantage to give space for employees in the District who are at present in rented buildings. The Government is paying exorbitant rent to-day for buildings located in the District of Columbia, and still we are running a theater in the Post Office Department.

Mr. FERNALD. I agree with the Senator that just as soon as it is feasible, and can be done in a business way, the Gov-

ernment ought to go out of all kinds of business, for the Government never made a success of anything of that sort; but it is true that the Navy has in many cities erected a great many buildings, and those buildings are necessary to house the Government employees. I am still, however, of the opinion that the Government would be wise, wherever it is necessary and it has the buildings, to turn them over rather than to make appropriations for the Navy to erect buildings, which will be done. In this instance it is simply turning them over after they have been built at an enormous expense, thereby saving the erection of other buildings, because otherwise the Navy will ask for an appropriation for the erection of similar buildings there. If we salvage them, we shall only have to go to work and erect other buildings at an enormous expense, because there are 6,000 people there who have got to be housed.

Mr. SMOOT. But the buildings would be there, whether we sold them or not.

Mr. FERNALD. If we sold the buildings, they would not be available, would they?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly they would. If we sold the buildings to private parties and they did not want to live in the buildings they had purchased, they would rent them to Government employees. There is no need for houses there at all if they are not to house Government employees. If the Government employees have made money enough during the last two or three years to purchase their own houses, I am very glad of it; I hope that the Government employee may own his own house and live in it; but if he does not, then he can rent it just the same as he is renting a house now from the Government of the United States.

Mr. FERNALD. I have stated the status of the case, Senators. The reason why we thought it was wise to turn them over to the Navy Department was simply to save the buildings we have at what it cost us, rather than to tear down and salvage and go ahead and erect new buildings at probably five times the expense of the construction which we already have on the ground.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERNALD. Gladly.

Mr. KING. If this policy is to be pursued, does not the Senator think that the Housing Corporation ought to get credit for the value of the property and the Navy Department be charged with it in whatever bookkeeping system obtains between the departments? Let me say to the Senator that, as I understand this measure, I am opposed to the transfer of these properties to the Navy Department, and I shall offer an amendment, unless I hear additional reasons, transferring these houses to the Treasury Department. If such transfer be made, the Treasury Department may lease the property to employees of the Government or to whomsoever it please, and the rentals derived therefrom could be devoted to meeting the expenses of caring for the property. There will be no profit to the United States in acting as a landlord, because the cost of maintaining the property and handling it will be in excess of the rentals obtained by the Government. I have no confidence in the Government as a landlord. The cost to the Government in conducting hotels and boarding houses and in handling dwelling houses for rental purposes will be very much greater than if private persons were engaged in the same business; and if we continue the Government in the hotel business and housing business and the real estate business generally we will continue a wasteful and extravagant system for which there can be no valid excuse. Moreover, if in times of peace we inaugurate the plan of housing civilian employees of the Government in the navy yards, imperative demands will be made that this system be installed in all yards, and finally at the arsenals and wherever the Government has any considerable number of persons engaged in service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, I desire to say that in section 5 it is already provided that "immediately upon the transfer of the said projects to the Secretary of the Navy" they shall "become available for the purposes appropriated, to be accounted for and audited as funds appropriated for the use of the Navy Department."

In other words, the Housing Corporation is to receive credit for the amount agreed upon for the transfer of the houses. Then we authorize the Navy Department to audit these funds as if Congress had made a direct appropriation for them to erect buildings. That is what section 5 proposes to do.

Mr. KING. I have not read the latter part of the section, but, doubtless, my colleague is correct in his interpretation of it.

I wish the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] would consent to a modification of section 5. I am so much in sympathy with the purpose of the bill, and have so often condemned the

Housing Corporation for its lack of economy, that I shall interpose no obstacles to the speedy passage of the pending measure. It does not meet in a satisfactory manner the entire problem, and fails to provide adequately for the closing out of the enterprise. The Housing Corporation is to be dissolved, but its duties are to be devolved upon the Treasury Department, and that agency is not compelled to wind up the entire business within a stated and definite time. Knowing the immortality of executive agencies of the Government, I am afraid we are "scotching"—not actually killing—the snake.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, for weeks I have been trying to get this bill before the Senate. It is costing the Government \$100,000 every month to provide employees for the United States Housing Corporation. It has been my desire to save some money for the Government, and yet I have been unable to get this bill up until to-day, and then I have obtained consideration for it only by the courtesy of my friend from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

I agree with everything my friend from Utah [Mr. KING] has said; I do not believe that the Government can carry on any kind of business economically; and I want to put every one of these agencies out of commission just as soon as I can.

I have considered this matter. For four months I conducted, as carefully and as conscientiously as any man could have done, an investigation of the War Housing Corporation. The Senator from Utah probably has read my report. I have made many criticisms of this activity, but this property is now in the Government's hands, and I have endeavored to find some way to get all we could out of it, and to dispose of the property involved at the earliest possible moment. Instead of carrying it on from year to year, I have long been anxious to close and wind up the affairs of the Housing Corporation. Here, however, is a lot of property that must be turned over to some department or to somebody, either to a bureau or a commission or a corporation. Why not turn it over to the Treasury?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FERNALD. Certainly.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will excuse me, my suggestion is to turn over to the Treasury Department the buildings that are described in section 5 of the bill.

Mr. FERNALD. Does not the Senator think it wise to turn over to the Navy Department the buildings in these two projects that are already on land owned by the Government and controlled by the Navy? The one at Bremerton is not on naval land, although the water supply for the 6,000 people occupying the buildings erected by the United States Housing Corporation does come from Government sources, as I understand.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that the objection I have to turning any of these projects over to the Navy Department is that soon after it is done the Navy Department will conceive the plan of allowing employees to occupy these buildings for nothing. Then we shall have demands made in every other navy yard and in the arsenals and wherever there are employees of the Government that the Government of the United States shall also furnish buildings for them; and, in my opinion, we shall in the end be compelled to expend millions of dollars.

My idea would be this: We are transferring the other projects to the Treasury. I do not think we have been very happy and felicitous in selecting the Treasury Department, and yet I have no quarrel with the committee by reason of that fact. Having, however, turned the other projects over to the Treasury Department, it seems to me it would be wiser to turn these projects over to that department and then let the Treasury Department rent these houses to individuals until they are sold. If the Navy Department charges a ground rental for the buildings the Treasury could pay the Navy Department out of the rentals received a reasonable sum, and the residue could be used to cover in part the operating expenses.

As I said a moment ago, of course we shall not get enough to meet the overhead expenses; but if the Senator will consent to such an amendment I will agree that if it goes to conference, and upon further investigation the Senator finds that that is impracticable, whatever plan is finally agreed upon, after further consideration, I shall not object to, because I am so anxious to have the matter closed up.

Mr. FERNALD. I know the Senator is as anxious as I am to close up this and other features of this matter.

Mr. KING. And the Senator will agree with me that I have done all I could to facilitate the consideration of the bill, and that there has been no opposition from the minority side.

Mr. FERNALD. If the Senator will prepare an amendment which will cover this matter, I will accept it.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I will state the amendment. I move to strike out, in line 12, the word "Navy" and insert the word "Treasury"; and also, in line 21, to strike

out the word "Navy" and insert "Treasury," so that it will read:

That immediately upon the passage of this act the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury the houses, dormitories—

And so forth. And starting at line 20—

the same to be maintained and operated under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury is going to operate the other houses. If he deems it wise not to salvage these properties, let him make some arrangement with the Secretary of the Navy by which the Navy will lease to the Treasury, for such period as may be proper, the ground, and then let the Secretary of the Treasury rent, as he rents the other buildings, the dormitories and structures that are alleged to be upon Navy ground.

Mr. FERNALD. In lines 3 and 5 on page 7 it will be necessary to make a similar change.

Mr. KING. Yes; I move the same amendment in those places. If the Senator will accept the amendment, and it goes to conference—if he then finds it is impracticable after further consideration, I will not press it.

Mr. FERNALD. I accept the amendment. I am anxious to get this matter through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Wolcott in the chair). The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, lines 12 and 21, and in line 3 on page 7 it is proposed to strike out "Navy" and insert "Treasury," so as to read "Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. SMOOT. A similar amendment should be made on line 5, page 7.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Also, on line 5, page 7, it is proposed to strike out the word "Navy" and insert the word "Treasury."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Secretary will now state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the words "granted by," to insert "sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of"; and on page 2, line 1, after "1918," to strike out "and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof," so as to make the section read:

That the power and authority to provide housing, local transportation, and other general community utilities as granted by sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, shall cease and determine as of the date of the approval of this act: *Provided, however*, That the power and authority granted by the said act of May 16, 1918, to requisition any improved or unimproved land or any right, title, or interest therein, on which houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and other general community utilities and parts thereof have been constructed, shall remain vested in the President, to be exercised when necessary to protect the interest of the Government, and to cease with the termination of the war when formally proclaimed by the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 17, after the word "including," to strike out "all" and insert "such"; in line 20, after the word "act," to strike out "and" and insert "also"; and on page 3, line 7, after the word "available," to strike out "for the purposes appropriated, to be expended under the supervision of the Treasury Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," and insert "for expenditures as a lump sum by the Treasury Department in carrying out the provision of this act," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the various offices, bureaus, divisions, and branches of the public service and of the various corporate or other agencies exercising the powers granted by the said act of May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof, and all that pertains to the same, including such officers, clerks, and employees employed therein, as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, also the official records and papers on file in and pertaining to the business of the said offices, bureaus, divisions, and branches of the public service and of the various corporate or other agencies and relating to the exercise of the said powers, together with the furniture, equipment, and supplies used in connection therewith, shall be transferred to the Treasury Department on the 30th day of June, 1920: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of any and all appropriations available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for the exercise of the power and authority prescribed in said act of May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof, shall continue available for expenditure as a lump sum by the Treasury Department in carrying out the provision of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 14, after the words "property of," to strike out "any" and insert "every"; in line 18, before the word "remaining," to strike out "and"; in line 22, before the word "legal," to strike out "such"; in the same line, after the word "form," to strike out "as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury is necessary" and insert "required"; and in line 24, after the word

"America," to strike out "to be disposed of" and insert "for disposal," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury on the 30th day of June, 1920, all property of every character whatsoever acquired under the power and authority granted by the said act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof, remaining undisposed of on June 30, 1920, together with all deeds, contracts, agreements, mortgages, assignments, notes, stocks, bonds, and other evidence of security or indebtedness: *Provided*, That the same shall be transferred in legal form required to vest the legal or equitable title in the United States of America for disposal in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment before we leave page 3. My attention was diverted at the time the amendment was agreed to, in lines 7, 8, and 9, striking out the words "for the purposes appropriated, to be expended under the supervision of the Treasury Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "for expenditure as a lump sum by the Treasury Department in carrying out the provisions of this act."

I wish to say to the Senator I think that is a very unwise amendment, and I wish to tell him why. The appropriations were made to end June 30, 1920. They are specifically provided for in the appropriation bill. The amendment means that all of that money which was appropriated, no matter what it was for, is to be thrown into a lump sum, and the Treasury Department is to expend it in carrying out the provisions of this act with no limitation whatever. They may run it over into the year 1922; the only reason that they would not do so is that no department of the United States Government ever allows an appropriation to last any longer than it can possibly get rid of it. However, the bill itself would authorize that; it is unlimited appropriation and the amount is placed in a lump sum.

Mr. President, the greatest evil involving the waste of money comes from the departments expending money appropriated in lump sums. There is no limit what they may pay for salaries or anything else, and if they have any favorites they desire to take care of it is always out of a lump-sum appropriation. I think, if the Senator will consider that amendment, he will realize that the bill as it was originally drawn would be very much better, because the money was to be expended for the purposes appropriated and "to be expended under the supervision of the Treasury Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921." It provides a limit, while there is no limit under the amendment the committee has suggested. Not only that, but all of the appropriations are put into a lump sum and the Treasury Department under this amendment can expend them in any way they desire.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, the reason for the amendment was that many of these properties have or are being sold, and, of course, as soon as they are sold all expenditures in connection with them cease and can not be carried to another project. For instance, in the property here in Washington the appropriation made will not be sufficient; but the properties at Rock Island, at Moline, and at Davenport have all been sold, stopping all of the expense incident to them.

Mr. SMOOT. That is another reason why we never ought to agree to this amendment. When those properties are sold the money ought to go back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FERNALD. It does go back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Then this amendment does not affect that. The bill provides—

That the unexpended balance of any and all appropriations available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, . . . shall continue available.

Mr. FERNALD. I shall not object to the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Senator will not insist upon the amendment reported by the committee. I therefore ask for a reconsideration of the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, beginning on page 3, line 7.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in section 4, paragraph (a), page 4, line 16, after the words "the same," to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That all deeds, contracts, or other instruments of conveyance executed by the United States Housing Corporation by its duly authorized officer or officers where the legal title to the property in question is in the name of said corporation, and by the United States of America by the Secretary of the Treasury where the title to the property in question is in the name of the United States of America, shall be conclusive evidence of the transfer of title to the property in question according to the purport of such deeds, contracts, or other

instruments of conveyance, and in no case shall any purchaser or grantee thereunder be required to see to the application of any purchase money.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

To conclude and execute contracts or other obligations and to collect the principal and interest of loans made or other sums due under obligations incurred pursuant to the provisions of the said act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof: *Provided*, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and that all deeds, contracts, assignments, or other instruments of conveyance or transfer executed by the United States Housing Corporation or other agencies through their duly authorized officer where the legal title was in the name of such corporation or other agencies prior to June 30, 1920, shall be conclusive evidence of the transfer of title according to the purport of such deeds, contracts, assignments, or other instruments of conveyance or transfer, and in no case shall any purchaser, grantee, or assignee thereunder be required to see to the application of the purchase money or other consideration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 22, to strike out the letter "c" in parentheses and insert the letter "b," and on page 6, line 6, after the word "thereof," to insert "*Provided*, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts," so as to make the clause read:

(b) To conclude and execute contracts or other obligations made or incurred under the provisions of the said act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof; to collect the principal and interest of loans made or other sums due under such contracts or obligations and to take such other steps as are necessary to protect the interest of the Government and to fulfill the obligations duly incurred in carrying out the power and authority granted by the said act and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof: *Provided*, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have paragraph (b) stricken out. Before I ask that, however, I want to ask the Senator a question. From the print of the bill, I take it that paragraph (b), beginning on line 22, is not in lieu of paragraph (b), beginning on line 3. It is another provision entirely, is it not?

Mr. FERNALD. It is another provision; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I should like to have paragraph (b) that the committee has stricken out read, to see just what it refers to—lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out the following words, beginning on line 3, page 5:

(b) To conclude and execute contracts or other obligations and to collect the principal and interest of loans made or other sum due under obligations incurred pursuant to the provisions of the said act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof: *Provided*, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and that all deeds, contracts, assignments, or other instruments of conveyance or transfer executed by the United States Housing Corporation or other agencies through their duly authorized officer where the legal title was in the name of such corporation or other agencies prior to June 30, 1920, shall be conclusive evidence of the transfer of title according to the purport of such deeds, contracts, assignments, or other instruments of conveyance or transfer, and in no case shall any purchaser, grantee, or assignee thereunder be required to see to the application of the purchase money or other consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I take that to mean that all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FERNALD. We thought the next section cleared it up. If the Senator will read the section beginning with line 22, he will see that it is more brief, and clears up the whole situation, I think, even better.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I asked the Senator—whether or not it was a substitute for that.

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; it is a substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read then and let us see if it is. I will ask the Secretary to read the next paragraph, beginning on line 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

(b) To conclude and execute contracts or other obligations made or incurred under the provisions of the said act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof; to collect the principal and interest of loans made or other sums due under such contracts or obligations and to take such other steps as are necessary to protect the interest of the Government and to fulfill the obligations duly incurred in carrying out the power and authority granted by the said act and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Then follows a proviso added as an amendment:

Provided, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think that does cover the substance of the part of the bill beginning on page 5, line 3, going down to and including line 21 on the same page. It certainly does if it refers to all the acts, and I think it does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment on page 5, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 6, after the word "thereof," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That all moneys received from the disposal of properties or otherwise collected in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 6, line 15, after the word "land," to strike out "adjoining" and insert "located near," so as to read:

That immediately upon the passage of this act, the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be transferred to the Secretary of the Navy the houses, dormitories, and schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Indianhead, Md.; the houses and schoolhouse on the naval reservation at Charleston, W. Va.; the land located near the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton, Wash., with the improvements thereon, consisting of a hotel and apartment house, together with the land purchased by the United States Housing Corporation adjoining the said hotel; the same to be maintained and operated under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 6. That the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," and the same hereby are, extended so as to authorize the President to direct the transfer to the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service such lands or parts of lands, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture under the control of the various corporate or other agencies of the Government not required for the purposes of such agencies, and suitable for the use of the Public Health Service, and the said act of March 3, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, amended to this extent.

And insert:

SEC. 6. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer without charge to the Secretary of the Treasury, for the use of the Public Health Service, such hospital furniture and equipment, including hospital and medical supplies, motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles, in good condition, not required by the War Department, as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals, and the President is authorized to direct the transfer to the Treasury Department of the use of such lands or parts of lands, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture under the control of any other department or executive agency of the Government (including the United States Housing Corporation, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, or other corporate agencies) not required for the purposes of such department or agency and suitable for the uses of the Public Health Service."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Maine what relevancy this section has to the subject of the dissolution of the Housing Corporation? It seems to me it is as incongruous as the introduction into a bill of this character of something dealing with the construction of an aerial railway.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, permit me to say to the Senator that there is already before our committee a bill carrying an appropriation of \$80,000,000 for the establishment of hospitals, and it was felt that some of this property could be transferred to the War Department and save, as I suggested in the case of the other clause, much money in erecting new buildings. This provision reads:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Then it goes on:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer without charge to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service such hospital furniture and equipment—

We have thousands of dollars' worth of furniture that would not bring anything on the market if it were sold that could be transferred to that department for the use of hospitals.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, it says "such hospital furniture."

Mr. FERNALD. Yes.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that it is the plan of the Senator to transfer to the Public Health Service furniture which the Housing Corporation has?

Mr. FERNALD. We have a great deal of hospital furniture, and the proposition is to turn that over.

Mr. KING. How did the Housing Corporation acquire a vast amount of hospital furniture; was it by the improper use of public funds?

Mr. FERNALD. Quite so; yes.

Mr. KING. By a gross usurpation of authority?

Mr. FERNALD. Well, they felt that they had authority. I do not think that they had, but they went on and bought it. They own the furniture, and, of course, it is practically worthless, except for such use as it might be put to in hospitals which the Government is operating.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not understand that in this boarding-house system down here they not only have hospital service but they have doctors? I do not know whether they have dentists or not—

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. But they are furnishing amusement halls—furniture for amusement halls—and it will all have to be sold to some one finally, or else the Government will have to continue to run a theater here, and down in New Mexico it will probably have to run a bull pen for bull fights. Whatever the public wants for amusement apparently should be furnished and paid for by the Government.

Mr. KING. Answering the Senator, I confess that I have not kept pace with the faddists and cranks who have projected themselves into governmental activities. It is about time that we got rid of some of these cranks and faddists and got some sensible American citizens to look after some of these public activities.

Mr. FERNALD. I agree absolutely with what the Senator has to say. I am wondering if the Senator has read my report on the investigation of the United States Housing Corporation, which covers several pages?

Mr. KING. No; I have not had the opportunity.

Mr. FERNALD. I have made some criticisms along those lines all through, and I commend the report to the Senator's attention.

Mr. KING. I shall take the first opportunity to read it.

Mr. FERNALD. We have in these buildings, all over the country, much hospital furniture. We have it here. We have a hospital down here which is filled with girls to-day, and is equipped with much apparatus and medicine for carrying on all the work that is to be done in any hospital. This bill simply transfers that to the Public Health Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. If my colleague will permit me, the Senator mentions the fact that there is pending before his committee a bill for the expenditure of \$80,000,000 for additional hospitals.

Mr. SMOOT. Eighty-five million dollars.

Mr. KING. Eighty-five million dollars, my colleague says. I want to suggest to my friend from Maine that when he becomes more familiar with the Public Health Service he will be surprised at their moderation. It is a wonder that they did not ask for \$150,000,000. The fact is, they ought not to have the \$85,000,000, and they will never get it with my vote, and I shall oppose it in every legitimate and proper way. I am not in favor now of giving to that organization, in this indirect way, anything else. Whatever they get, let them get it as the result of a fair and full investigation, and let the needs of the organization be fully demonstrated. I have no doubt that they would take \$100,000,000 worth of hospital fixtures, and what not, if the Government had them. I think it is unwise to turn them over in this way. If this organization ought to have them, let them buy them in the proper way, under appropriations which are made by Congress, or upon full investigation, if it is clear that additional hospital supplies or other property are needed, then by appropriate legislation designate the amount and value of the same and charge the Public Health Service with it and credit the agency that parts with such property.

Mr. FERNALD. I will say to the Senator that this bill contemplates that. He will find on page 8, down in line 6, the following provision:

And the President is authorized to direct the transfer to the Treasury Department of the use of such lands or parts of lands, buildings, fixtures—

And so forth. That is all provided for. It simply turns it over to the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMOOT. I wonder if the Senator has read the last provision, to which he has called my colleague's attention. He will find that it goes further than the first provision. The first provision is that "such hospital furniture and equipment, including hospital and medical supplies, motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles, in good condition, not required by the War Department, as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals," shall be turned over—and what

more? Under this amendment you authorize, and direct the President to transfer to the Treasury Department "the use of such lands or parts of lands, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture under the control of any other department or executive agency of the Government," including the United States Housing Corporation, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, or other corporate agencies, "not required for the purposes of such department or agency and suitable for the uses of the Public Health Service."

I want to say to the Senator that that means that the President of the United States can transfer to the Public Health Service almost any of these buildings and any lands he may see fit to transfer that are not being used now by any of the agencies of the Government. The Public Health Service requested \$85,000,000, as the Senator says. I have the statement in writing of an official of this Government who says that beyond a doubt every one of the soldiers who will require hospital attention can be taken care of in the soldiers' homes as they exist in the different parts of the United States to-day.

Mr. FERNALD. Let me say to the Senator that I have already taken that up and written to these homes, and I find that that is absolutely true. In this instance, however, here is a lot of medicine, thousands of dollars' worth of medicine, that would not sell for a cent at auction or at private sale, and this simply transfers it to the Public Health Service. Now, of what earthly use would that be to anybody, and who would buy it? In this instance, however, it may be turned over to that department and will save the Government from the necessity of purchasing those things.

Mr. SMOOT. If the amendment only went that far, nobody would object to it; but medicine is included. Medicine is not land; and lands, of course, are not to be used by the Public Health Service to administer to patients.

Mr. FERNALD. But there are hospitals that may be used by the Public Health Service, instead of expending \$85,000,000 in the building of more hospitals. Let me say that it is much more economical for the Government to turn over such hospitals and such lands as they now have. Instead of going ahead and making another appropriation and building more houses on purchased land, this property that is not worth a cent may be turned over for the use of the Public Health Service under this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The proper thing to do is to have the Public Health Service come before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and ask for an appropriation to build these buildings, and then it will not be made if we have these buildings to transfer to them.

Mr. FERNALD. They get everything they come before the Appropriations Committee for, and all the other committees.

Mr. SMOOT. But if the object of the amendment is as the Senator says, then the amendment is drawn in the way that it is drawn by the department for some purpose.

Mr. FERNALD. The purpose, I think, I can explain to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment says what the purpose of it is.

Mr. FERNALD. Does the Senator know that the United States Housing Corporation is incorporated in many States? The United States Housing Corporation that we have here is not the only such corporation. They are incorporated under the laws of the State of New York and other States.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill already provides that all of these transfers shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury. That does not affect this at all, and I tell the Senator that this is dragged into this bill because there is not a bill that passes Congress but that the Public Health Service are looking for an opportunity to add something on to it; and all they have to do is simply to say, "It is for the health of the people," and any kind of an appropriation on the top of the earth is granted.

Mr. FERNALD. I thought I was doing a great service to this country when I proposed turning over the medicine and the appliances that we have in these hospitals, and the hospitals that the Government has already built at a tremendous expense, and saving the building of other hospitals for which bills are already pending before committees, and will go through somehow. The amount will not be \$85,000,000, but there will be something appropriated, probably.

Mr. SMOOT. But the trouble is that the amendment does not reach what the Senator thought it did reach. The amendment is drawn so that they can take any buildings or any lands.

Mr. FERNALD. Any lands that these corporations may have in the District of Columbia or in the various States.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it refers to any agency of the Government, or any department of the Government, or any kind of building.

Mr. FERNALD. The Emergency Fleet Corporation have a little property that is embraced in this bill, but another bill will

be drawn to turn over that property. It seemed to me a very wise thing, after it was shown to me where they had property and the use to which it was put, that it should be embraced in this bill. I can not see any objection to that amendment. I am sure that it is saving thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Government to turn over to the Public Health Service property that we already have and that will not sell for a single dollar, either at private sale or at public auction.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the amendment were restricted to what the Senator thinks it is for it would be all right, but it grants sweeping authority to the President of the United States to turn over to the Public Health Service any of the buildings that any department of the Government is not using.

Mr. FERNALD. The President already has that authority under the act of March 3, 1919.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, then, if he has there is no need of this amendment.

Mr. FERNALD. With the exception of the properties that the Housing Corporation had, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation of New York and other States.

Mr. SMOOT. This amendment is not limited to that. If it were I would not object for a moment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. FERNALD. Will the Senator wait for just a moment?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. FERNALD. I think the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has an amendment to offer which may cover the matter.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I realize that the power given in that part of the amendment to which reference has been made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is a pretty broad and sweeping power, and I am going to move an amendment. I move, after the word "hospitals," in line 6, page 8, to insert a period and to strike out the remaining part of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask the Senator if he would not accept such an amendment.

Mr. FERNALD. Would not the Senator be satisfied if we included the appliances and medicines in the hospitals now already owned?

Mr. SMOOT. They will be included in it. The Senator will find in line 2 that it reads:

Including hospital and medical supplies, motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles in good condition not required by the War Department as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals.

Mr. FERNALD. I accept the Senator's amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "hospitals," in line 6, strike out the comma and all down to the period in line 14, so the section will read:

Sec. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer without charge to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service such hospital furniture and equipment, including hospital and medical supplies, motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles in good condition not required by the War Department as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] consent to another amendment, as follows: After the words "supplies," in line 3, page 8, strike out the words "motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles, in good condition, not required by the War Department, as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals"?

If I believed that the Public Health Service would act fairly and reasonably in the matter, I would not object to that language; but, as my colleague has said, that agency is so grasping that it will not be content until it gets millions for additional buildings not necessary and for equipment costing millions which is not required. It will demand vehicles not required, and thereby lay additional burdens upon the Government.

Mr. FERNALD. I could hardly accept that, for the reason that we have thousands of motor trucks here now that would be practically useless, and the department would simply buy new trucks. It seems wise, therefore, to turn these over to that department.

Mr. KING. Of course; but are we going to authorize them to purchase additional trucks? We have made liberal appropriations for this service for the purchase of necessary equipment, and I think its needs are satisfied. Certainly they are until the regular appropriation bill, which will soon be passed, places additional funds at the disposal of the officials. We made liberal appropriations for the Public Health Service for motor

vehicles and for whatever else was necessary to cover the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. FERNALD. This provides for trucks not required by the War Department. They are practically useless.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that he knows that by previous legislation we authorized the War Department to turn over to the Agricultural Department and, I think, to the Public Health Service motor vehicles that the War Department does not require, and there have been turned over to the Department of Agriculture—at least there have been allocated to it, according to information furnished me some months ago—some 18,000 motor trucks and motor vehicles. I do not know how many more have been allocated, but it was stated they were going to allocate to the Agricultural Department more than 25,000 motor vehicles. How many have been allocated and turned over to the Public Health Service by the War Department I am not prepared to state.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Was not that transfer of motor transports by the War Department limited to the Post Office Department and the Department of Agriculture? Were there any allocated to the Public Health Service?

Mr. KING. My recollection is that there were some, but I will say to the Senator that I am not positive.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey and to my colleague that I think the words ought to remain in the bill, but if they do remain in the bill, and the Public Health Service ask for motor trucks in their estimate for the next appropriation bill, they will not get them. We are no longer counting by the hundreds or thousands the motor trucks and the automobiles which the Government owns now. We are counting them by the acre. "How many acres have you?" If we give the trucks to them now and can thus stop an appropriation for such purpose hereafter, I think that is exactly what we had better do.

Mr. KING. If my colleague will permit, I think that his suggestion would be a wise one were it not for the fact that the Public Health Service have such an ambitious program. They are not now satisfied with hundreds of employees and a few million dollars annually, but they demand thousands of employees and tens of millions of dollars. There are overlapping divisions and constantly increasing demands. With that ambitious program, and if the bill passes with this provision in, I make the prediction now that they will submit demands to the War Department for thousands of motor vehicles upon the theory that their ambitious and extravagant program will ultimately be carried through and approved by Congress. If there were some limitation in the bill as to the number to be turned over to them, I would not object. But I warn the Senator that if the bill goes through in this form the Public Health Service will make demands upon the War Department for hundreds, if not thousands, of motor vehicles, based upon the extravagant and ambitious program which some of its officials have projected. Senators will be surprised when they are brought face to face with this bureaucratic agency and learn of its plans and purposes. Already it has inaugurated a plan to go into States and investigate the schools and exercise a sort of paternalistic care over school children. Surveys of various kinds are being planned. Thousands of employees are scurrying throughout the land, all at Government expense. Soon a department of public health will be demanded, and millions annually demanded for its support. Executive agencies grow great and fatten upon the credulity and negligence of the people.

Mr. FERNALD. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment to the amendment for the very reason that he suggests and that his colleague suggests. We have these motor trucks by the thousands of acres. There is a bill now on the calendar to erect buildings for them that will cost several hundred thousand dollars. If we could turn these automobiles and motor trucks over to somebody for nothing, it would be money saved to the Government.

Mr. KING. The Senator fails to catch the point I was attempting to make, namely, that if there is no limitation placed upon the functionaries of this service they will demand far more than they need. The Senator says we have these automobiles, so let us get rid of them. If we turn them over to this department and it does not need them, it will have charges against the Government for maintenance and for the upkeep of the vehicles, which, in the end, will aggregate thousands and tens of thousands of dollars per year. It is not economy to give to some department thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of vehicles when that department does not need them. The Senator now, I respectfully submit, is not acting in

the interest of economy by turning over to this service without any limitation whatever the large number of motor vehicles which it will demand simply because the Government has "acres" of them which it is not using and which are costing the Government a great deal to maintain.

Mr. FERNALD. I hope the amendment to the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. KING. I shall not press it if the Senator from Maine will not accept it. I had hoped he would accept it or at least accept a limitation as to the number. My only reason for not demanding a vote is that because of the lack of a quorum it would result in defeating the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 9, line 9, after the word "Corporation," to strike out "on June 30, 1920"; in line 14, after the word "effective," to insert "on June 30, 1920"; and in line 15, after the words "this act," to strike out "on June 30, 1920," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of Labor immediately upon the passage of this act shall cause to be instituted such legal steps as are necessary to wind up the affairs of the United States Housing Corporation, so as to dissolve the said corporation and all other corporate agencies heretofore and now exercising the powers and authority granted by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof, and to make effective on June 30, 1920, the transfer to the Treasury Department provided for by this act: *Provided*, That on June 30, 1920, the Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 19, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes" (United States Housing Corporation), and in addition thereto shall furnish a detailed statement showing all real and personal property acquired under and by virtue of the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 16, 1918, and other acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof; showing the use to which each piece of property was applied and showing all property disposed of, together with the cost and the amount received from the sale of the same: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor shall furnish a copy of the said report to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator from Maine that if these amendments are agreed to there will not be any requirement as to a date in the bill?

Mr. FERNALD. Oh, yes; the amendments strike out the date in two places, but it is found in the proviso—

That on June 30, 1920 the Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress in accordance with the provisions of the act—

And so forth.

Which winds up the affairs of the Housing Corporation. We cut out the date in two places and have it appear only once.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator from Maine if he will consent to an amendment in section 4 which will limit the time within which the Treasury Department must make disposition of this property?

I call the Senator's attention to a fact with which he is familiar, namely, that if we give an executive agency any discretion as to the duration of its existence, it will never die. If you leave it to the discretion of any department, I do not care how patriotic the employees of that department may be, there will be a thousand excuses urged for the continuance of the agency or the instrumentality. We may be settling the business and activities of the Housing Corporation, but we are not ending the projects which have cost millions. We are permitting a discretion to the Treasury Department, and I prophesy that unless there is further legislation we will for years hear of this incomplete work. We should fix a time limit and compel the settlement of every phase of the questions and matters involved within that limit. Our work by this bill is incomplete.

Mr. FERNALD. The Senator, I think, must realize that it is an impossibility to close this out entirely, for the reason that notes which run for some years ahead have been taken for the property, and it will be necessary to collect the interest on those notes. It is quite impossible to close out entirely the business of the Housing Corporation, although it ought not to take any or very many extra employees with the Treasury Department, because the Housing Corporation expects to sell all of the property and get everything into notes and money to be turned over to the Treasury Department.

Mr. KING. Suppose the Housing Department does not sell the real estate, and it is turned over to the Treasury Department?

Mr. FERNALD. I think it would be unwise to provide that the property must be sold by a given date, because it might not be advisable. The price might not be fairly made on the property that must be sold. I do not think it would be wise to fix a date when everything should be closed out that is now owned

by the Housing Corporation. It can not be done, because these dormitories here in Washington could hardly be sold by the 30th of June. I think it is wise to leave it in the hands of the Treasury Department.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator will regret the conclusion that he has announced. If more Senators were here, I should ask for a vote upon the amendment, but I know we can not get a quorum to-day, and that would defeat the passage of the bill. Therefore I shall not press it, but I warn the Senator now, if he will permit me, that unless there is a limitation placed in the bill there will be urged as long as he is in the Senate of the United States pretexts for the maintenance of an organization in the Treasury Department and the retention of scores, if not hundreds, of employees for the purpose of handling the remnants of the defunct Housing Corporation.

I think that the Senator ought to consent to an amendment compelling the winding up and sale of all of the property of this corporation by the 30th of December, 1920. If the Senator does not do it, I assure him now that as long as he is here he will be compelled to face demands for appropriations for the salaries of a large number of employees who will be retained by the Treasury Department.

Mr. FERNALD. I do not accept that because I do not think it would be wise.

Mr. KING. Rather than defeat the bill, I will not press my suggested amendment; but I express the view that it is unfortunate that we can not free ourselves from the clutches of scores of unnecessary executive and administrative agencies. We are destroying one by this bill, but only changing its form. It will still persist as a division or bureau in the Treasury Department.

Mr. STERLING. I desire to suggest a formal amendment in lines 22 and 23, page 3 of the bill. The language, with the amendments adopted, is as follows:

In legal form required to vest the legal or equitable title.

I think the word "such" should be restored before "legal" and the words "as is" inserted before the word "required," so that it would read "in such legal form as is required to vest legal or equitable title."

Mr. FERNALD. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which "such" was stricken out.

Mr. FERNALD. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays the unfinished business before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 10, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 9, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. MANN of Illinois assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our souls unto Thee, O God, our Heavenly Father, from whom cometh all wisdom, strength, and purity. Teach us, we pray Thee, how to think consecutively and reach wise conclusions, that we may do our whole duty as it is revealed to us as individuals and as a people.

Generation after generation comes and goes. History repeats itself with dire consequences. Hence we pray for wisdom to guide us, strength to sustain us, that we may do our duty and avert evil to ourselves and mankind. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 7, 1920, was read and approved.

CONFERENCE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY POSTS, ETC.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8819, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8819) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California if the item of \$2,700,000, relating to the purchase of the Dayton aircraft plant, is embodied in any of the Senate amendments?

Mr. KAHN. I do not believe it is.

Mr. MADDEN. If it is, will the gentleman be willing to bring that item back for the consideration of the House?

Mr. KAHN. I have no objection whatever to doing that.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection, then.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this, I understand, is the bill that provided certain emergency sites?

Mr. KAHN. It is the bill to allow a continuation of work on some posts and aviation fields which was stopped under the provision that was put into the Army appropriation bill approved last July. This allows a continuation of that work. I want to say to the gentleman that there was a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs that went to nearly all of the various sites involved. That committee came back and made a report, and the Senate put some additional items on the bill.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. GARD. The subcommittee which made the report reported unanimously in favor of the Dayton-Wright project at Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. KAHN. I do not recall whether or not there was a unanimous report on that. I will frankly say to the gentleman that when the bill passed the House "the gentleman from California" was at home in California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there are several Senate amendments touching matters relative to which I think there is a very decided opinion on the part of the House. I have confidence that the House conferees will represent strenuously—and, I trust, successfully—the judgment of the House touching those matters.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. With the consent of the House, the present occupant of the chair will name the conferees. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following conferees were announced: Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DENT, and Mr. FIELDS.

WOMAN-SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a telegram read relating to woman suffrage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada asks unanimous consent to have read a telegram relating to woman suffrage. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CARSON, NEV., February 7, 1920.

Hon. CHAS. R. EVANS,
Washington, D. C.:

Nevada Legislature ratified national suffrage amendment at 10 minutes past 12 o'clock to-day.

EMMET B. BOYLE, Governor.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE ON LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on next Thursday we will celebrate throughout the Nation Lincoln's birthday, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House on the subject of Lincoln at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House on next Thursday, Lincoln's birthday, for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there not a previous order of the House in reference to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WEBSTER] addressing the House on the same day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read for the information of the House the order heretofore entered.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. My request is to follow his address.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. FESS, by unanimous consent:
Ordered, That Mr. WEBSTER be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, Thursday, February 12, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, following the address named in the order already entered. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to this request and remind him that this matter of granting requests for future addresses on legislative days has been discussed in the House a number of times, and I remember having one of my colleagues desiring to ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes at some future date, and I suggested to him that he see the gentleman from Wyoming and try to arrange to let him be heard. But it is bad policy to undertake to agree now upon unanimous consent for debate at some future date, not knowing what will come up on that date. I merely call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to it, because if this request is granted other requests will be made and it will be difficult for him to be consistent.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and the House understand my position in regard to these matters. I have said on several occasions that I felt it to be my duty to object to unanimous-consent requests of this character under ordinary circumstances. I have felt, however, that I could not properly object to addresses that related to important anniversaries. And while any Member of the House has a right to object in a matter of this kind, on the anniversary of the birthday of a very great man I do not feel that I can make objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MONAHAN]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PRICE OF COMBED COTTON YARNS.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. TILSON. I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 451.

Whereas the prices of combed cotton yarns have increased several hundred per cent during the years 1914 to 1919, inclusive, more than 100 per cent of which was during the last six months of the year 1919; and

Whereas this increase has been greatly in excess of the increase of the cost of the raw cotton and the labor entering into the manufacture of such yarns, and can not therefore be attributed to such increases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby requested to inquire into the increase in the price of combed cotton yarns during the years 1914 to 1919, inclusive, and especially during the last six months of the year 1919; to ascertain the cause or necessity for and the reasonableness of such increase; to ascertain the difference between the increase in the price of the yarn on the one hand and the increase in the cost of raw cotton and the labor entering into the cost of the manufacture of such yarn; and to report to the House at the earliest practicable date the result of the investigation, together with such recommendations as the commission may deem advisable and proper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the further consideration of the resolution and for its immediate consideration in the House.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, just a brief statement. I have spoken to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee in regard to this, and he informs me that owing to the pressure of the railroad-bill conference there has been no meeting of his committee since the introduction of this resolution. He himself has no objection to it whatever, and, so far as he could see, there was no objection to this request being made. I have also conferred with the Federal Trade Commission, and find that the commission is willing to make the investigation, and would have done it upon my request as a Member of Congress, except for the fact that the commission has so many requests of this kind. It seemed that the commission has heretofore tried to confine itself to requests made by departments of the Government or by one of the Houses of Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. Did the gentleman consult with the minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Mr. TILSON. I did not. I spoke to the chairman only. Mr. RAYBURN. I object, Mr. Speaker, to the request.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request in reference to the observance of the birthday of Mr. Lincoln. It has been customary in the House for several years, after the reading of the Journal, to have Lincoln's address at Gettysburg read. My former colleague, Mr. Russell, of Missouri, inaugurated the custom, and he read the address every year during his service. I had the honor of reading it myself last year. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be exceedingly appropriate for the House this year to request the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], immediately after the reading of the Journal on Lincoln's birthday, to read the Gettysburg address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that on Thursday, before or after—

Mr. RUBEY. After the reading of the Journal—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Immediately after the reading and approval of the Journal—

Mr. RUBEY. And before the speeches are made—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is requested to read the Lincoln Gettysburg address. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12272, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12272, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve it.

Mr. BLANTON. When the House adjourned Saturday evening I had made a point of order to two provisos in the paragraph beginning in line 9, page 27. The gentlemen from California, three of them, Mr. HERSMAN, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. LEA, desired to be heard on the merits of this paragraph, and in order that they may have 5 minutes each, the three gentlemen, I reserve the point of order for 15 minutes for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I stated the point of order last Saturday, but I will restate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desires to reserve his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it in order that the gentlemen may be heard on the merits of the paragraph.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MADDEN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. It is this—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN] yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to know whether or not consent has been granted for the 15 minutes allowed to these three gentlemen. Is it done by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has reserved his point of order, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN]. There is no consent granted for specific debate. A motion for the regular order, I suppose, would bring either the withdrawal or the making of the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN] recognized for five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may we have it understood that at the end of 15 minutes the point of order will be disposed of?

Mr. BLANTON. I will state that I intend to make the point of order then.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask, then, for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MADDEN. I make it now. The gentleman can be taken off his feet on a point of order, can he not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman reserve his point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. If it is to be reserved for 15 minutes and then made, I think it would be a saving of time to make it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order.

Mr. HERSMAN. I ask that the gentleman may withhold it in the hope that we may present this matter in such a way that the point of order will be withdrawn.

Mr. MADDEN. In view of the fact that one of the Members was heard for five minutes on this subject on Saturday, I am perfectly willing to withhold it for five minutes, to give the gentleman from California five minutes. I will not extend it beyond that.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is not to be taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I find myself in a most trying position. What I may say or fail to say may affect the destinies of many families, and I hope that I may have the indulgence of the gentleman who has made this point of order so that I may present the facts as they appear to me.

The Federal Government for 15 years has had under its control two tracts of land in California, of 20 acres each, in different sections of the State. They have been carrying on experiments on these vineyards for a period of 15 years. The Government has collected from every part of the world different varieties of grapes, and they have now assembled 700 different varieties, which are being cultivated and studied on these two tracts. The real value of these experiments of over 15 years can hardly be measured in dollars and cents. There are 180,000 acres devoted to the culture of wine grapes in California; there are 210,000 acres devoted to the culture of raisin grapes in California; and hundreds of thousands of acres devoted to the culture of table grapes. These experiments carried on by the Federal Government have sought to find the soils suitable to these different varieties of grapes and the kinds of grapes suited to the resistant roots that are so necessary to the successful cultivation of grapes in California. The passage of the eighteenth amendment has made it necessary for the owners to sell these two tracts, and without them are purchased the Federal Government will lose the largest and most valuable collection of grapes in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If these grapes are worth several hundred million dollars, including the land on which they are grown, does the gentleman think that the business men of California, for the want of \$27,000, will allow this experimentation work to be wiped out, when they can buy this land, or still lease it to the Government and allow the Government to continue the carrying on of the experiments, without buying the land?

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BARBOUR. These experiments are being carried on for the benefit of the industry all over the United States. The State of California is not penurious in its expenses in that State, but these experiments are being carried on for the benefit of the industry wherever it exists in this country. It is not a local proposition.

Mr. HERSMAN. I must hasten along, as my time is limited. We all know the difficulty of collecting money from a large number of people for experimental work. Experimentation is the work of the State and Federal Governments.

We would not appeal to the Federal Government if it were possible to get the State of California to advance this money at the present time. But it is not possible, as the legislature of our State will not meet for a year and a half, and any legislation that we could get through at that time would be entirely too late to meet this emergency. We have only the Federal Government to appeal to to secure these tracts which are so valuable to our viticultural interests. The purchase of these two parcels, besides being sound economically and appealing to the good business judgment of every man, also appeals to the moral side of our nature. It seems to me there is an obligation resting upon the Federal Government at this time to interest itself in securing these tracts. Under the passage of the eighteenth amendment the income from 180,000 acres has been wiped out. Six thousand families found themselves in a day reduced from a position of security to poverty, their sole means of livelihood having been taken from them.

Mr. Chairman, I care not how we voted or how we thought as to the advisability of passing our prohibition laws, there is in every American heart a feeling of fair play and justice which would prompt every man to hope that in some way or by some means this vast amount of wealth could be saved, that a way could be found to utilize our wine grapes by discovering a method by which their sugar content could be extracted or by experimentation find the proper table grape to graft onto these old and mature vines. I can not believe there is a man in this Congress who has so little business sagacity that he would not be willing to appropriate a few thousand dollars in order to try to save millions of dollars to the economic resources of our Nation. By finding a way to utilize the wine grapes of California the saving in taxes to the Federal Government in one year from this property would far exceed the expenditure proposed by the Agricultural Committee for the purchase of these two tracts.

And, further, Mr. Chairman, I can hardly see how anyone who felt it his duty to vote for the prohibition amendment could so harden his heart that at this time he would not be willing to vote to appropriate a few thousand dollars in order to find a method of saving the property which he had thought it his duty to vote to destroy. In addition to the financial wisdom of purchasing this property and the moral obligation which seems to me to rest upon the Federal Government so far as it can to assist the vineyardists of our State, there is also the human compassion that will appeal to everyone to aid as far as possible those who through no fault of their own have been deprived of their property. The vineyardists of California a few years ago could not have looked forward to the sweeping enactment of the prohibition amendment, as the State and Federal Governments have continued to encourage them to plant and tend to their vines. They and their families face the future without hope of saving any of their long and hard fought for gains. If we can now step in and with the expenditure of a small sum of money point the way to a different use for their property, a use that is not in conflict with our laws, certainly we have done something, and not more than should be done by our Federal Government. And if we are successful in our efforts we can rejoice with them. It is hard to realize—

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Is your purpose in advocating that proposition due to the fact that you want to make the transition that is necessary on account of the Federal amendment from an economic expenditure and for the benefit of your people?

Mr. HERSMAN. We have 180,000 acres in wine grapes, and we do not know how to use those grapes. We are in hopes that a method will be discovered by which these grapes can be utilized, their sugar content extracted, or a suitable process discovered by which they can be manufactured into a non-intoxicating beverage; or they may be successfully grafted into the right kind of raisin grapes, perhaps. If these two experimental stations are wiped out the Federal Government will have absolutely nothing to start with. They have spent 15 years in experimenting on different varieties, and now we are up to a point where if the land is not secured the work of many years will be lost. It will take years to start over again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman and his statement of the case have been so illuminating that I think there is a great deal of merit to the item to which I made the reservation to the point of order, and in view of what the gentleman says and the fact that he has convinced me, I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. LAYTON. I ask that the gentleman have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I still have my reservation.

Mr. LAYTON. I insist on the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. If the regular order is insisted on—

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

Mr. BLANTON. If the regular order is insisted on, which would prevent our colleague from California [Mr. LEA] being heard on the merits, it forces me to make the point of order, or waive it, and I make the point of order to the two provisos on page 27, in the paragraph which begins with line 9, providing for using \$27,000 to purchase land in California. It is new legislation, unauthorized by law, and it is a bad policy for this Government to indulge in.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard a moment on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. LEA of California. I do. I am familiar with the circumstances in this particular case. The land in question is not in my district. One of these vineyards is in the district of my colleague [Mr. CURRY of California] and the other in the district of Mr. BARBOUR. The situation here is not purely one of purchasing land. The Government already has a partial title in this property. At the present time the title of the Government is a leasehold interest, which is going to expire. We determined that the only practical thing to do is to acquire this property by purchase. The Committee on Agriculture did a businesslike and commendable thing when they inserted this provision in the bill. It will be helpful to the grape industry in California, which is a great industry.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Has the Government any investment there in the shape of buildings, and so forth?

Mr. LEA of California. Not in the shape of buildings; but the Government has an investment of thousands of dollars that will be lost if this particular property is not retained.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the nature of that investment?

Mr. LEA of California. It consists of the experimental vines. The Government has there the greatest collection of vines on earth, assembled in these vineyards. These vines are attached to the soil and will be lost unless the Government retains this property.

There are two fundamental reasons why the Government ought to do this. The first reason is that there is at least \$100,000,000 invested in vines in California. As a method of permanently improving them, this experimental vineyard is entirely consistent with businesslike principles and economy.

Second, and the pressing point is that prohibition has destroyed the value of at least \$40,000,000 worth of vines in California that at the present time are of no practical value for any other purpose. Now, what we want to do in the immediate future is for the Government to solve the problem it is attempting to solve, of making these vines usable for food purposes, by grafting them into varieties that will furnish a food product that can be lawfully supplied to the commerce of this country and the commerce of the world without violating the law. I appeal to the gentleman from Texas to consider this proposition, and ask him to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it not a fact that we import annually into this country from France and the countries of southern Europe over \$1,000,000 worth of Zante currants?

Mr. LEA of California. Very much more than that.

Mr. BARBOUR. And the Department of Agriculture is already experimenting with the idea of producing these so-called currants in California, which are really small raisins, and the department believe from the experiments already made that these currants can be produced in California.

Mr. LEA of California. That is absolutely true. The experiments are now in progress.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will go with the gentleman to any reasonable extent to assist these wine growers in California in rehabilitating themselves and getting into a new business, but we can do that without buying land. The gentleman knows, and every other man here knows, that if we buy this land out in California it is going to mean the expenditure of thousands of dollars in the future, and it is a policy to which I am not going to be a party when it can be prevented by a proper point of order.

Mr. LEA of California. There is no other practical way of doing it, because this investment of the Government, representing thousands of dollars, is in these vines which are attached to the soil, a part of the realty, and the Government loses them the moment its lease expires. I believe the Committee on Agriculture deserve great praise for attempting to help this industry in California. It was a common-sense, businesslike thing to do. What they propose would be helpful to a great industry. If the gentleman wants to help these men rehabilitate themselves, there is no better way to do it. In fact, it is a pressing problem. These men must either dig up \$40,000,000 worth of vines or else have a hope that may induce them to go ahead to turn the product of their vines into a food product.

We have experimental stations over this country. It is not a new policy. It is simply continuing a policy that already exists, and this great industry can be materially increased and developed, even though the Government retains these experimental vineyards for a long period of years.

Mr. MILLER. Can not the Government do it more economically under the method provided in this bill than it could otherwise?

Mr. LEA of California. No business man on earth would abandon these vineyards. Nothing could be more absurd than to throw away the investment which the Government already has and allow somebody else to acquire the property.

Mr. RAKER. I should like to be heard for five minutes on the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. May we have a ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. RAKER. I should like to be heard.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am going to make a motion in a moment that we permit the discussion of the question. I insist on a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. RAKER. Before the Chair rules on the point of order, let me say this to the Chair: It has been shown that the Government has appropriated money and has expended it in the vines that are on these two vineyards. The Government by its lease holds an interest in the real estate, a leasehold interest, to be sure. Now, while the point of order goes to the question of the right to change from a leasehold to a purchase, could not the Chair legitimately hold that this is simply changing from a leasehold estate, which the Government now has, to the obtaining of a title for a longer period of time in a thing that the Government already has an interest in?

That being the case, if technically it can not be maintained and the Chair technically has to rule upon the point of order, then I appeal to the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order that this is not a discussion of the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. I have the five minutes, and the Chair will hear me, and then I am through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is discussing the point of order. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from California if the land provided for in this proviso adjoins any tract of land already owned by the Government?

Mr. RAKER. I understand it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, in line 13, page 27, the figures "\$110,200" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$80,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Page 27, line 13, strike out the figures "\$110,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$80,000."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to cripple this service. We appropriated for the current year \$83,200 under this item and provide that \$20,000 of it may be used in connection with the investigation of grape culture. Now, the committee brings in a provision for the purchase of land that will cost \$39,000.

I confess I have not been quite able to understand why in this critical situation of the grape industry of California we

should be asked to buy land which without the critical condition we had no trouble in leasing.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman permit me right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman will state a thing which is to the point, I will yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. Until the eighteenth amendment was adopted—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not the point.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am getting to the point as fast as I can, and the gentleman will see that it is to the point if he will permit me to state the proposition. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will if the gentleman will get to the point.

Mr. BARBOUR. These experiment stations are on the land of people who were in the business of producing wine grapes. The eighteenth amendment has wiped that industry out of existence. Had the industry continued, this agreement would have gone on without limit of time, but now these men who are no longer interested in the business of producing wine grapes are selling their lands. They are selling the lands on which these experiment stations are located.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, we are told repeatedly that the prohibition amendment has rendered the grape industry of California almost innocuous, in spite of the fact that grapes are selling for higher prices than ever before.

Mr. BARBOUR. This year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If this land could be leased while there was a profitable industry being carried on in growing wine grapes, and that industry has ceased, will somebody explain why the Government can not lease the land when the industry has been taken away?

Mr. BARBOUR. The lessor of the land is parting with the title to it, and the lease can not continue.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They can not use this land on the basis of \$600 an acre for any purpose except raising grapes. That is nearly \$1,000 an acre for this land.

Mr. BARBOUR. And a most reasonable price.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It may be for raising grapes, but for nothing else.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is what the land is used for.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is all it is good for. They tell us that the industry is to be destroyed, and therefore they must have the land to raise the grapes on. If the industry is to be destroyed, what do they want to raise more grapes for? If the industry is to be continued and the land is to be worth \$1,000 an acre to raise grapes on it, there is no reason why the Government should buy the land.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I do not yield. Each of the gentleman has had time to explain to the House and neither one has. I am not opposing your investigations out there. I am perfectly willing to let you carry on your investigations. The land item has gone out of the bill, and there is no reason why we should make the appropriation to buy the land and then have the Government divert it to something else in no way connected with the raising of grapes. I am perfectly willing to give them \$20,000, as they have this year, or more, if they need it, for the grape investigation. I do not think that we ought to say that we will put in a bill an item of \$39,000 for the purchase of land, and then when the item goes out leave the total sum the same and encourage the department to use the money somewhere else in no way connected with the raising of grapes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. First, I would like to modify my amendment so as to insert the figures \$83,200 instead of the other figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the proposed modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 13, strike out the figures "\$110,200" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$83,200."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois this question: He seeks to reduce the total sum in the value of these two tracts of land. That is all the amendment proposes?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is all. I seek to reduce the amount that was cut off for the purchase of these two tracts of land.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to answer the question that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has asked, Why are these vineyardists suffering if this land is worth \$600 per acre? This land as a vineyard is worth nothing because it has 700 varieties of grapes on it. Who wants to buy a vineyard with 700 varieties of grapes? The value of that land is not in the grapes that are on it, but in the land itself, as it is in close proximity to Fresno and in the rich Napa Valley. It is worth \$600 an acre without anything on it. The 700 varieties of grapes that the Government has put there are a menace to the land, to a private owner. No man wants to buy a vineyard or an orchard with 700 varieties of grapes or trees. What could he do with them? The only ones it is valuable to is to the Government of the United States and the people of the United States, because of the fact that for 15 years the Federal Government has collected and experimented on many varieties of grapes in order that the vineyardists of the whole United States may improve the quality of their table grapes and improve the quality of their raisin grapes and improve the quality of their wine grapes, and to find out what kind of grapes are congenial to the resistant stock and what soils are favorable to the different varieties of grapes. That is the value of this property. It is because the United States Government for 15 years has collected varieties of grapes from all over the world and has placed them there. This property is now going to be sold. The reason it is going to be sold is: The California Wine Association, the largest wine manufacturers in the United States, owns 600 acres in this one tract and 3,000 acres in another tract near by. When the eighteenth amendment went into effect their business was wiped out, and they are disposing of all of their property, all their vineyards. We find that this tract of 20 acres, which the Federal Government had as an experimental station, is a very valuable piece of property. It is worth \$600 an acre without a grapevine on it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If this item is not decreased, if we keep the item as it is, would it help to carry on these vineyards? If the department can not carry on the vineyards anyway, I do not see why it should not go out. If this sum remains as it is now in the bill, does the gentleman understand that they could make some arrangement for further leasing to carry on these vineyards?

Mr. HERSMAN. We have tried in every way to get aid. The legislature of our State does not meet for a year and a half, and these vineyards are to be sold now. We are hoping to save to the grape industry of California and of this Nation this valuable collection and to preserve this station. The Federal Government has got to come to the rescue. If it does not, it is absolutely lost. It is illuminating to find that every man in this House realizes the wisdom, the good business sense, the moral obligation, and stirred by human compassion is anxious to purchase this tract with the one exception of this wart from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. I want to say this: I am mighty glad that all the rest of that splendid Texas delegation have hearts and souls and would not so demean themselves as to deprive 6,000 families of a helping hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman is getting mad now. The gentleman from Texas can maintain his own position on this floor. He is big enough—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. And broad enough and strong enough to maintain his own position.

Mr. HERSMAN. You can be assured I will maintain mine.

The CHAIRMAN. Both gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I will not object, because I think he ought to revise them when he cools off.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Evidently the gentleman who has made the motion does not appreciate what this amendment means or what was in the original amendment. The Government owns these varieties of grapevines and they have cost a large sum of money. It has taken years to gather them together. They are valuable property not only to California but to the entire United States. They were gathered for the purpose of wine grapes alone, but it has been demonstrated in some grafting that has already been done that these 700 varieties, by proper grafting and pruning and handling, will increase the food products of this country by many millions of dollars.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TINCHER. I am in favor of the purchase of the land, involving an expense of \$27,000, and I have wondered if the gentleman could see that there was no use of carrying that amount of money?

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman's statement is quite lucid. The point is, it is not for the purpose of continuing the growing of and experimentation with these various varieties of vines for wine. The amendment is in operation. The people understand the situation, and why should not this Government, with the expenditure of money already incurred, continue to improve and make valuable one of the staple crops of the country, whereby the people may receive more of the raisin grapes and grapes of the table variety that have been and are being produced in California? That is what this amendment amounts to. The purpose here is to add a fruit product and to provide that large amounts of it may be raised.

The country is acclimated to it. The people are familiar with it. From this two or three hundred varieties may be obtained and become more valuable to the owners and to the country by reason of grafting and re-grafting and handling the varieties that have already been obtained. That is what the gentlemen from California [Mr. LEA and Mr. HERSMAN] are appealing to this House for at this time. That is what we are all appealing for, not to destroy your own property but to assist in building up an industry that, by virtue of the efforts of the Agricultural Department, has grown so valuable. It is unfortunate that legitimate, proper developments of the agriculture interests, where the climatic conditions are so advantageous, should be defeated. We hope that when the bill gets into the Senate the Senate will place this item back on it again, to the end that we will have it disposed of by the conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I did not oppose the original provision of the bill for the purchase of the land. I knew nothing about it. It might be that there was some good reason for it, and I made no opposition to it. But when the item of \$27,000 for the purchase of the land goes out of the bill, the amount ought not to be left in the aggregate in this paragraph, because it will only encourage the department to spend the money uselessly somewhere else. They can not spend it for the purchase of the land unless there is specific authority given. I have simply proposed to reduce the appropriation to that of the current year, which covers the investigation, but does not provide for the purchase of land which can not be bought.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman understand that the \$20,000 which was expended last year, or authorized for a specific purpose, can now be spent under this language as it stands without the insertion of the proviso carried in the bill last year?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was going to ask that question myself when this amendment was disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In the current appropriation law is this language:

Provided, That \$20,000 of this amount may be used for investigation and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages.

I would like to ask the committee whether it is perfectly confident that under the item for the investigation and improvement of fruits, and so forth, it will be possible to use any portion of the \$80,000 for investigating the new grape industry?

Mr. HAUGEN. It will; yes. But to make it clear that the \$20,000 be used for it, it was set aside to be available for that purpose. But I take it the department would use the amount. They need not use the amount if not given the authority, but

if we indicate to the department it should be used for this, they can do so. The language will do no harm. It is not necessary either way.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not desirable to specify, so that we will know?

Mr. HAUGEN. The custom is to either specify in the act or in the report, and the department takes notice of what is set out in the report, where it is the intention that the amount should be used for a certain purpose. If set out in the report or the act itself, the department will take notice of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And this \$20,000 was included in their estimate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. There is no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I had not proposed it, but I had intended to do so. I have no desire to put anything in that is of no value.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am certain that the \$20,000 will be available and will be used for that purpose, and that is the wish of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating, in cooperation with States or privately owned nurseries, methods of propagating fruit trees, ornamental and other plants, the study of stocks used in propagating such plants and methods of growing stocks for the purpose of providing American sources of stocks, cuttings, or other propagating materials, \$20,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a little inquiry about this item. I do not know how much information was given before the Committee on Agriculture, but I just assume that this is a result of the plant-quarantine order. I would like to make an inquiry as to whether there has been any complaint made to the Committee on Agriculture in reference to the plant-quarantine order.

Mr. Chairman, on the 1st of last June, I believe—although I am not sure of the same—an order went into effect forbidding the importation into the United States of any plants, shrubs, or anything else from plant life that was growing, with the exception of tulip bulbs and some other bulbs, and plants coming to scientific institutions, and it was afterwards modified to permit plants coming for certain propagating purposes and certain classes of plants that are bought entirely for propagating purposes. I called the attention of the House to the situation a year ago and predicted that there would be a good deal of complaint about the order by the nurserymen and florists of the country. Since that time nearly every national association connected with plant growth, such as the nurserymen and florists, and special associations, have passed resolutions denouncing the plant-quarantine order, which I have been asked many times myself to denounce, but I never have done so. I am not sure yet whether it is a desirable thing or not. I have no complaint of it myself at this time. For a while it looked as though the whole country would be swept with the desire to set aside the plant-quarantine order. I do not know whether that agitation has continued so much or not. Here, for instance, is one of the things that was said, and I know this will be very interesting to the Members of the House, namely, that they could not import orchids any more. I have noticed the number of orchids that the Members of the House are frequently buying. But it has been discovered now that they can raise orchids with very great success in the United States, and one of the largest series of greenhouses in this country has now thrown off everything else, I believe, except orchids, and is engaged in propagating them. I do not know whether they will get any information out of this item or not. I would like to know just what the department says it wants of this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has reference to the order issued by the Federal Horticultural Board under the Department of Agriculture. There has been criticism of the order in the past.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Federal Horticultural Board, under an act of Congress, has jurisdiction of quarantine—quarantine within the State—

Mr. HAUGEN. It has the authority to make rules and regulations and to issue orders.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the rules and regulations they have power to quarantine. Now, of course, the law provided quarantine, apparently, under special circumstances, on special findings; but the Federal Horticultural Board has issued a gen-

eral quarantine order. I do not say they are wrong. I do not know.

Mr. HAUGEN. There has been criticism in the past as to the order. This matter has been discussed for the last two or three years. It was discussed at length during the debate on the bill last year. My understanding is that the nursery people and others interested have taken the matter up with the department and that a better understanding has been reached. I am not advised as to just what took place.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The order has not been modified to any extent, so far as nurserymen are concerned.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understand that it is satisfactory at the present time to those most concerned, and that little objection is now being raised to it.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was speaking with regard to the success of domestic nurserymen in propagating orchids. I understand that is being done a great deal in various hothouses throughout the country. I understand also that the stocks have to be renewed from abroad from various East India islands and parts of South America periodically, and if they are not renewed that business would go out of existence in this country. Is that true?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not true in the way the gentleman puts it. Of course, there are people engaged in that all the time, hunting for new orchids. We do not have those, but it is not necessary, so I am now informed, to import the stocks. They can propagate them here where they have them. Of course, under this plant-quarantine order, if they discover new varieties of orchids, they can be brought in for propagating purposes, being new and novel.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will turn to the Book of Estimates, to the language used there, he will find that the purpose is to establish and maintain mother forests. The committee struck out the language, and provided that it shall be done in cooperation with private nurserymen, not to establish new stations, but to carry on the work of encouraging the production of orchids through private enterprise.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I observe that this is entirely a new proposition. We are proposing to appropriate \$20,000. Being new, my attention was attracted to it, and I reserved the point of order for the purpose of asking for an explanation of what it is for, because I think the gentleman will agree with me that every new proposition ought to be scrutinized somewhat closely.

The remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in regard to the foreign plant quarantine order and the cultivation of orchids are very interesting and illuminating, but whether they apply to this particular section or not I should like to find out.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will permit, the purpose of this item is simply to assist the industry in this country.

Mr. GARD. rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. GARD. To inquire whether this little colloquy over there is entirely localized or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire recognition?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be glad if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. TILSON. I yield under the reservation that the gentleman may give the information desired.

Mr. ANDERSON. The purpose of this item is to enable the department to assist the industry in this country to produce the stocks and seedlings here which formerly they got from abroad, and which they can not now get by reason of the plant quarantine order to which the gentleman from Illinois referred.

Mr. TILSON. Can the gentleman state just how this aid is given?

Mr. ANDERSON. The department contemplated the establishment of so-called mother orchards in forest lands and the production of seedlings, with the idea that these seedlings shall be sent to nurseries in large quantities, so that they become commercialized. We did not approve of that proposition. We thought they might just as well assist and promote the propagation of these seedlings and stocks by the nurserymen themselves, without establishing the mother orchards out in the forests, with all the buildings and employees necessary under those circumstances.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman understand that specimens of plants, shrubs, or trees are to be furnished to private orchards and nurseries?

Mr. ANDERSON. In small quantities. The new ones always have been furnished, and will be in the future, until they can be produced by the nursery for commercial purposes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman will understand that our nurserymen have always imported, for instance, large quantities of certain kinds of fruits and cherries and plums for budding or grafting. The stock has been imported. That is what they call the stock being imported. The plants themselves are of no value except to be budded or grafted. They have been raised in France or Holland or Belgium. Now that supply is cut off. They can raise them here; there is no great difficulty about that. The question is largely a matter of expense. When they could be imported there was no great ambition here to find out the method of handling them in the cheapest way. Probably that is one thing they want to do.

Take, for instance, the experimental plant, the azalea. Before the war the Christmas plant most in evidence was the blooming azalea. None of them were produced in this country. They were all imported. They were brought up in hothouses to bloom. The importation ceased under the quarantine order. It is quite possible that without much expense in connection with private industry, by directing attention to it, they may find methods of propagating azaleas so that they could profitably be used. You did not see any last Christmas, and you may not see any for some time until there is some method of propagating them cheaply.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it not a fact that one of the purposes of this service is to find the localities where the climatic and other conditions are such that the stocks can be produced that were formerly produced on the other side? I will say this to the gentleman from Connecticut and to the Members of the House, that those of us who have any large nursery plants in their district have had their attention called to the desirability and necessity for the appropriation. I have such nurseries in my district, and I am satisfied that this item is of value and importance.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the superior wisdom of the committee that has recommended this appropriation, and I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, \$130,000: Provided, That of this amount not to exceed \$56,600 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ELSTON. I would like to know from the chairman of the committee why the additional amount of \$56,600 is provided, when it appears that the appropriation of \$130,000 covers the distribution as well as the tests and propagation of these new and rare seeds. Why should you have a double appropriation for the distribution?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is simply to indicate that \$56,600 of the \$130,000 may be used for this purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. Can the gentleman tell me what the distribution consists of, and to whom the seeds are distributed? Why is so large an appropriation recommended for that purpose?

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe the principal seed distributed under this item is alfalfa seed. A number of rare seeds are sent out throughout the country under this appropriation.

Mr. ELSTON. For how many years has the appropriation been carried on, and for how many years has the distribution been going forward?

Mr. HAUGEN. This item has been carried in the bill since 1914.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman believe that after we have employed five years in propagating and testing we have probably arrived at the possibilities in this line, so that it might be time now to cut this appropriation out and start on some new adventure?

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe they are making discoveries year after year. Recently some valuable alfalfa seed was discovered for use in North Dakota. It is fair to assume that under the investigations to be made new and valuable seeds

will be discovered and introduced into this country. I believe that it is the most valuable seed item in the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the distribution made only of new and rare seeds, recently discovered since the last appropriation, or is the distribution made of old seeds?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This has nothing to do with the Congressional distribution.

Mr. ELSTON. This seed is distributed through Congressmen, is it not?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Once in a while, if you apply for them. They are not sent out freely by the department.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Members from certain sections of the country are allotted a certain number of packages of alfalfa seed, Sudan grass seed, and other seeds. The seeds most adaptable to the respective sections of country are allotted to the various sections.

Members from my section of the country are allotted a number of packages of alfalfa seed, Sudan grass, and soy bean. Members from other sections are allotted seeds that are more adaptable to their sections of the country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They do not allot anything to the city people. It is not a general allotment.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman wants any allotted for the city of Chicago, he can get them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have more agriculturalists in my district probably than the gentleman from Iowa has.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then the gentleman is entitled to the allotment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I did not say "farmers." I said "agriculturalists."

I think it was under one of these three items which are grouped together that the durum wheat was introduced into the United States. The value of durum wheat to the United States generally is many times the expenditure that the Government has ever made on all three of these items.

Mr. ELSTON. Then the gentleman from Illinois believes this is a proper activity?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think this is the one shining light in the Department of Agriculture. My only regret is that the items are usually so drawn that they permit the Department of Agriculture to make search for new and rare things all over the world outside of the United States, and do not permit them to do what they ought to be doing, go out here on the western plains and in the Rocky Mountains and discover natural plants which, if developed, would be of great value to the country. We permit them to go to Siberia and discover plants which grow under somewhat similar conditions, but if they went out here on the American plains to discover one and develop it they would not be permitted to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$239,416. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packing, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, shall upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture, that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipts of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to

those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have a perfecting amendment to the text.

Mr. BLANTON. I have a perfecting amendment that will come before the gentleman's motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL], a member of the committee, is entitled to make his motion to strike out the paragraph. The perfecting amendments will be voted upon first. Gentlemen who desire to offer them will be recognized.

Mr. LANGLEY. May I offer my amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] has been recognized.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. HAUGEN. To ask unanimous consent to limit debate.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I suggest 30 minutes on a side.

Mr. HAUGEN. This matter has been discussed often, and every Member knows exactly how he is going to vote on it. Would not 15 minutes on a side be sufficient?

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I have requests which make it necessary for me to ask for 30 minutes on a side.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour.

Mr. HAUGEN. Half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and half the time by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL].

Mr. BLANTON. I object. It is not fair to have all the time controlled on that side of the House.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. That arrangement is agreeable to me.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his objection. Is there objection to the request to limit debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto to one hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and one-half by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment which I propose to offer may be read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PURNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he proposes to offer may be read for the information of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment also be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his amendment be read for information. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LANGLEY: Page 30, line 9, strike out the figures "\$239,416" and insert the figures "\$358,980."

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Texas for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 31, line 7, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to be"; and, on page 31, line 8, strike out the words "addressed franked" and insert in lieu thereof "lists of constituents, all of such seeds to be mailed under frank of said department."

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not making this motion to strike out this paragraph for any idle purpose. I am in dead earnest.

This is the first opportunity, so far as this bill is concerned, to apply the acid test to those who preach economy and practice profligacy in the expenditure of the public money. [Applause.]

There are a great many items in this bill that can properly be scrutinized. The expenditure of a great deal of money appropriated by this bill can properly be questioned; but in my judgment this provision, or any other provision carrying an appropriation for a continuation of this pernicious practice of scattering throughout the country at the expense of the people seeds that are not wanted, not needed, not used, is indefensible.

I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say to the membership of the House that the members of the committee were not able to agree upon any amount.

I know this is an old subject, and that it has been discussed for years and years upon the floor of this House, but our committee was not able to agree upon an amount. A number of votes which were had to determine whether or not the bill should carry any amount at all resulted in a tie, and there was no decision. The bill carries \$239,416, put in the bill by common consent in order that the matter might be brought before the House for consideration and final determination.

I was not a Member of this House when this practice was first started, but I am convinced in my own mind that it has ceased to serve the purpose for which it was begun. [Applause.] I am told that when appropriations were first made for sending out these free seeds broadcast over the country, it was done for the purpose of investigation and experiment, and I say to you that it has ceased to serve that purpose.

Gentlemen, there is one thing we can not lose sight of, and that is that we are to-day facing in this country a deficit. Nothing is quite so sure as death and taxes, and with a \$3,000,000,000 deficit staring the already overburdened American taxpayer in the face, it is incumbent upon every Member of this House to cut, to prune every one of these appropriation bills to the very bone. I am not willing to cripple any branch of this or any other governmental service, but I am willing to resolve all doubts in favor of economy and cut until it hurts wherever cuts can be made.

If we are to have economy we must make a start; we must not pass an item because it seems small.

We can not come in here before this House and strike \$3,000,000,000 from any one bill, but by taking off a few thousand here and a few hundred thousand there it is possible in the aggregate to cut \$3,000,000,000 and save a bond issue.

I am not going to try to anticipate anybody's argument in connection with these seeds. I only want to state my own position. I do not believe in them. I do not believe this appropriation serves any good purpose. I do not say it does not serve any purpose, but I say that the purpose it does serve does not warrant the expenditure of this amount of money. It may encourage some of the boys and girls throughout this country to get a little closer to nature; it may serve to teach some boy or girl on the farm or in the city that farming is not the drudgery it has been painted; but I want to say to you that if you have that in your minds and if that is the purpose you want to accomplish you will find on page 74 of this bill an item of \$1,500,000 for agricultural extension work.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The gentleman has consumed five minutes.

Mr. PURNELL. I believe I was recognized for 30 minutes, and I will ask the Chairman to call my attention when I have used 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will do so.

Mr. PURNELL. There is carried in this bill an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for agricultural extension work that really accomplishes something, that really does something. Through the agricultural colleges of the United States, through Federal assistance, boys' and girls' clubs and home economic clubs are organized, and those who have left the soil are inspired to return, while those who are on the soil are encouraged to stay. If this money is properly used and expended, as I believe it will be, all will be accomplished that the wildest advocate of this antiquated system can hope to accomplish. So that if you want to send garden seed broadcast throughout this country to encourage the youth of America to plant gardens, to raise beans, cabbages, and potatoes, you had better let it be done through some organized effort rather than scatter these seed broadcast, half of which will not grow when planted. The question is one of economy. The mere fact that we have established this practice and have followed it for years does not necessarily carry with it the implication that it ought to be continued. I

sincerely hope that you will avail yourselves of this opportunity and agree to my amendment, thereby putting an end to a practice that is a relic of political barbarism. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that as a matter of economy of time at least this annual opera bouffe, the dramatic personae of which seem for the most part to be statesmen with a single-track mind, ought to be discontinued. The membership of this House has time and again shown their desire for a continuation of this congressional seed distribution. Most of those who in the past have sought to have the seed appropriation stricken out apparently rejoice in opposing the little things that contribute so much to the pleasure and enjoyment of the needy masses of the people.

Mr. SIMS. And the profit also.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes. And yet they want to send millions of our people's money to keep the needy of other lands. An analysis shows that the opponents of this appropriation belong either to that class or represent districts which do not even raise the proverbial cabbage patch. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] says that half the seeds that are sent out from the Agricultural Department do not grow. That is not true as to Kentucky. We have splendid soil down there and they all come up. It may be true in Indiana, and especially in the gentleman's district [laughter], because I have been told that there is some land in Indiana that will not even sprout peas. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman says that this seed distribution might help us to get back to nature a little bit. If that means a little more work on the farm, I think after looking at the gentleman's physique and at mine, all will agree that we both might very profitably do a little more work on the farm in the way of *avoirduois* reduction. [Laughter.]

I have had occasion to investigate this question a little bit, and I undertake to say that the annual expenditure of the amount involved, which has never been as much as \$400,000, does more real good in general to the agricultural people of this country than any expenditure of a like amount that could be made in any other direction. [Applause.] It will prevent profiteering in seeds also.

The Agricultural Department estimates that these packages, containing five packets each, cost only a little less than 4 cents, and they cost nearly five times that much if purchased from retail dealers. Not only that, but it is estimated that the number of vegetable seeds alone sent out under this distribution will plant 170,000 acres of gardens, and think of the enormous advantage that will be to the agricultural interests of this country, and especially at this time when the cost of living is so high and increased production so essential to its reduction.

Mr. QUIN. Does the gentleman know how much in money the garden seeds alone amount to?

Mr. LANGLEY. I think for last year it was about \$327,000, but I am not absolutely sure of the accuracy of these figures. It is my purpose to offer at the proper time an amendment striking out the amount carried by the committee's bill and to insert the amount carried in last year's bill for the current fiscal year. I would like to see it more than that. I wish I could multiply the committee's figures by two, so that we would each have enough for all of our constituents.

Mr. QUIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. At the same time we have to economize some, in view of the state of our finances, but let us not seek to practice a penny-wise and pound-foolish economy. I am not in favor of that. I am told that in a great many sections of the country, a year or two ago, the farmers were unable to get any garden seeds at all except those that they received through their Congressmen. I do not know whether that is the situation this year or not, but it is worthy of consideration in this connection.

I am in favor of continuing this distribution, but I want to tell you that these very gentlemen who are opposed to any appropriation for garden seed are not consistent enough to refuse to accept them. If they think it is wrong, why not give them to some one else who does not regard it as petty congressional graft, as it has been termed. To my mind the man who accepts graft believing it to be such is the most consummate grafter of them all. Without mentioning any names I will say that I have gone to a number of them who say they so regard it, and I have said, "I see that you are opposed to this appropriation for sending out garden seeds. Of course, you have plenty of them to your credit, and I need them down in Kentucky, for I do not now get as many as my constituents could use properly and profitably. Will you please lend me yours?" They invariably reply, "Oh, good Lord, John, I am trying to borrow some myself." [Laughter.] They will not let you have a single package. That is the truth about it.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] himself, who makes this motion, will use every package provided for in the bill for his district. He does not expect his amendment to carry. These antiseed men bob up untiringly every year and seek to strike out the appropriation. They know that the motion is not going to be adopted. They have been beaten every time, and they are going to be beaten again. After this is all over I am going to my friend from Indiana, and I am going to ask him if he wants to give me his quota, and I will bet \$10 to 5 cents that he will not do it, because he wants to send them out to Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. PURNELL. Why, of course I would not give them to the gentleman. They belong to my district. If the Government pays the money for them, they belong there. I do not want the Government to waste the money. I would send out skunk oil if they would send it out free.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman prefers skunk oil to garden seeds for his district, I shall not object; but I want the people of the tenth district of Kentucky to get every dollar from the Federal Treasury they can use profitably and to which they are entitled, not only for seeds but for Federal buildings, river and harbor improvements, and the building of public highways, and anything else within my reach that will inure to their benefit. [Laughter and applause.] If the gentleman does not follow the same program, I am afraid that some fellow will succeed him in Congress before long. [Laughter.]

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In answer to the further suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana, in view of the fact that he does send them out and that his people take them, is not that a further evidence that they want them?

Mr. LANGLEY. The deduction was so self-evident that I hesitated to make the point against my genial friend from Indiana.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Possibly the gentleman from Indiana might be induced to move an amendment to have his district stricken from the benefits of the distribution.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman from Virginia would make the motion and substitute skunk oil. [Laughter.]

Mr. PURNELL. I would say to the gentleman from Virginia that that hardly befits his usual dignity. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I hope those who are opposing this wasteful expenditure will be more successful to-day than they have been on former occasions. It would seem to me that this year, when a real effort is being made to save money on the various appropriation bills, we might muster up a better vote than heretofore.

I represent an agricultural district. There is not a city in my district with a population of more than 8,000 people. The people there are practically all farmers. I want to say to you that, so far as I know, there are no farmers in my district who believe this appropriation ought to be continued. It has been stated to me time and time again by those who receive these seeds that they are no better than can be purchased for a few cents at the corner grocery store. If we were sending out to the farmers a new variety of seed, a rare variety of seed, a kind of field seed that could not be bought at the corner grocery store or from regular seed dealers, then there might be some excuse for continuing this expenditure. The fact is that these seeds can be bought in any town or village. I want to say also that the people of the country are not being fooled at all. They understand what it means. I do not think it adds anything to the dignity of a Congressman to come here session after session and vote for such a proposition as this. There are very few people in the country now who do not understand that the seeds are being sent out largely as an advertising scheme, and it is not especially creditable to the membership of this House to continue the farce any longer. The statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] is a good, straight argument—a convincing argument for getting rid of this expenditure now for all time. If it ever did have any value to the country, that time has long since expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if there is any one thing particularly which has made Senators and Representatives ridiculous from New York to Galveston, from Norfolk to San Francisco, it is the free-gift garden-seed proposition. If we only knew exactly what our people thought about this subject and how much ridicule they and our newspapers heap upon us every

time we spend the people's money on these measly little old packages of garden seed with our franks on them we would stop it. It is a useless expense.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I can not yield. I would yield if I had the time.

But if the people do want the seed, adopt my amendment and let them have it, but take the politics out of it. Take our names off the packages. Can not you render sufficient valuable service to your people here, if they elect you, without sending them this measly little package of garden seed? I propose a plan to eliminate the politics, to take our franks off of the packages, and let the Agricultural Department send them out. Then you would see how soon Congress would cut the appropriation. If you cut the frank off you will not make an appropriation. You will lose your interest in the farmers, as you call them.

Let me tell my good garden-seed friend from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] that his farmers down there would rather that the taxes be cut down, so that they could buy their own garden seed, than to have us tax them this enormous sum of money every year to send them a little 10-cent package. I want to cut it off. I am going to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] to cut them out entirely, but if we do not do that, then let us take politics out of it by adopting my amendment, and let us put seed mailing in the Agricultural Department, where it belongs, and let the Agricultural Department send the seed out. We could furnish the lists. You say they do not know to whom to send them. We can furnish them the lists of our constituents. Let the people understand that it is their money that is being spent so freely. It is not a present that their Congressmen and Senators and Delegates send them every year. It is bought with their own money. It is foolishness and ought to be stopped.

I will tell you how much I think about it. I have not even yet sent the names to the Agricultural Department for my allotment. I have been too busy trying to do something more valuable for my people than sending this garden seed out. I have not even sent the names in yet. I have not had time to begin addressing the franks. My people have not bothered me about them.

I want to tell you right now that if we mean economy we could save this \$300,000 this year and we can take that much off of the taxes. Are you going to do it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Gentlemen, I hope I will not be accused of playing politics when I tell you that I am for both of these amendments. I shall vote first for the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]. If that fails, or if it carries, I shall then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] to strike out the whole proposition. In my honest opinion it is a first-class nuisance to have a Congressman called upon to send out garden seed over the country. [Applause.]

I represent purely an agricultural district. There is not a town in that district with 10,000 inhabitants. My people are devoting their time to the raising of cotton and rice and agricultural products of all kinds, and especially in the growing of truck in the coast region of Texas, and I assure you there is no better country on the face of the earth for truck growing than in that coast section.

As the garden-seed business is at present, I consider it a nuisance, as I have told you. In the past three years I have received an average of one package for every five families in my district. I either want sufficient for all of them or I want none. Those who can not get them are as much entitled as those who receive them. And inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] is to be voted upon first, I shall support that amendment, and, whether it is carried or not, I shall then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] to strike the thing from the books altogether. If there ever was a time when this was necessary, in my judgment that time has passed. I do not believe the people of this country desire to have this expense saddled upon the taxpayers at this time. We have all the burdens of taxation we can afford, and I think it is the time to commence curtailment and apply the pruning shears on expenditures. But if the Congress proposes to continue the system, then we ought to increase the appropriation, as the amount stated in the bill will be entirely insufficient. Why should we appropriate an amount suffi-

cient to supply less than one-third of the people? How can we justify our conduct in voting to give the seeds to one constituent and denying them to two or three others? I want them for all or for none.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if any member of this committee would insist that this is necessary legislation. At least there might be some difference of opinion as to whether it is wise legislation at this particular time. I doubt very much whether there will be a single additional garden seed planted just because we distribute these seeds. [Applause.] I doubt very much whether there will be any considerable increase, even noticeable increase, in the total production of agriculture in this country because we have seen fit to spend nearly a quarter of a million of dollars for the distribution of seeds. To a great many men this whole matter is a matter of ridicule. I would not say that it has no value, for that would be wide of the mark. Extravagant statements of that kind seldom appeal or convince. But that it has a value equal to the amount of money that is expended is a very doubtful question.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. If a package of these seeds should get into the hands of a poor laboring man or a poor widow and enable him to raise a garden, would it not be of some value there?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Certainly it would be of some value there; but a poor laboring man or a poor laboring woman who has secured a garden and is able to have it plowed and has the time and is able to secure the tools for its cultivation would not necessarily be deprived of that garden because he did not receive a 15-cent package of seed.

I think we beg the question sometimes. I am not saying that this seed distribution has no value; but we have dealt in large sums here to such an extent that we think it insignificant to save to the Treasury nearly a quarter of a million dollars of money that is absolutely needed. There are a great many people who look upon this seed distribution as a useless expenditure. So far as the distribution is concerned, my own idea is that the seeds belong to the people and not to Republicans or to Democrats. But it is an annoyance, a nuisance, a difficult thing to secure an equitable distribution of the seed, and I this year got mine out of the way as quickly as possible by sending the seed to the newspapers in my district, both Democratic and Republican, and asking them to advertise the fact that they had received the seed and that the people who really wanted them might call for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I was as rantankerous against the congressional distribution of garden seed as my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANCK] seems to be now. I learned in the early stages of my experience here that in order to rank as a statesman you had to take a position against the congressional distribution of garden seeds. [Laughter.] However, I endeavored to find out what my people in the district desired with respect to this matter, and to that end I sent out at my own expense 54,000 letters of inquiry with a return card, on which a 2-cent stamp could be placed, and in answer to those letters I received 22,500 replies, to the effect that the seeds were wanted by the writers. My friend a moment ago said that he sent his quota out to the newspapers of his district. Most Members of the House who oppose the free distribution of seeds send them out that way if they send them out at all. It takes some time and work for a Congressman to send the seed out to the right persons—that is, to the persons who can use them. It requires attention and care and considerable expense to do the job right, and I take it that when this custom was first started that it was intended by Congress that since the Member had an acquaintance with his district, he would send them out to those who needed them. If you send them out to the newspapers or to the post office and let them be distributed in that manner, in nine cases out of ten the newspaper men or the postmaster wants to get rid of them as soon as he can. Arm loads are carried out by those who can not use many of them. Many of them, no doubt, find their way to the gutter. The farmer is not going to drive to town and go to the newspaper to get a package of garden seed, and

only a few of the deserving garden raisers of the cities and towns will do so, but they usually appreciate and make good use of a package that comes to them through the mail.

I recall a speech our present President made somewhere in Ohio, as I remember it, where he estimated that the increased raising of gardens in 1918 saved something like \$500,000,000 worth of food, which we were enabled to furnish to our soldiers and our Allies, and he spoke with highest praise of the people's efforts to increase garden products. One of the ways to decrease the cost of living is to encourage and stimulate production of garden materials. According to the estimates I have heard made here to-day it only costs about \$75 to furnish my district with about 20,000 packages of garden seed. I am sending out about 23,000 packages. My allotment is not that large, and necessarily I have to obtain the difference from some of these statesmen who are opposed to sending them out, or, rather, I hope to get them from the Agricultural Department, which is enabled to furnish them by reason of the disinclination of some Members to send them out. Now, I can assure you that it costs me much more than the value of the seeds to find out who wants them and send them to them. As far as I am personally concerned, I feel like a great many others feel, that it is an expense and a great amount of work that could be taken from a Member of Congress by failing to make an appropriation for the Agricultural Department to buy them, but I want to say that the results in my district from the distribution of seeds are good. It was worth the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. You say they did you some good? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes; it did me good, and it did my district good in increasing garden products; and it will do your district some good, Mr. WILLIAMS, if you will send yours out in that way. I am satisfied that most of the opposition to the appropriation for garden seeds comes from the men who do not want to shoulder the responsibility of sending them out in the proper way, and I am willing to concede if they are merely dumped in a few places in the district they will not make a very good showing. The gentleman from Texas said that he would not even send his list over to the Secretary of Agriculture. I venture to say he has no list. If he had a list of those who had expressed themselves as desiring garden seed and would spend his time in franking them the Government packages of seeds, I have no doubt but what the results would have been much better than for him to spend so much time making points of no quorum in the House. You send men out through the country at high salaries to vaccinate hogs for hog cholera, to teach the people how to make cottage cheese, and a hundred other things. You employ 750 messengers in the Agricultural Department alone. None of your statesmen-ecopomists rave very much about this expense, but when it comes to the proposition of furnishing free of charge to every person in the district who desires and ought to have a package of seeds to stimulate production, then you raise the cry about economy and say in defense of your position that Congress is being ridiculed about the distribution of garden seeds. Of course, if you send them out to your general list and some go to a man who lives in an apartment house and has no garden, he will immediately say that the distribution of garden seed is a failure, and he will probably write you or tell you of what a small business you are engaged in. He would not consider that there are thousands of people in your district who can and will use them profitably, and in so doing stimulate production, increase varieties, and reduce the cost of living. It seems to me that it is a poor time to discontinue the distribution of seeds. I believe I have given it a fair test in my district. I know I have hundreds of influential men who do not believe in it, but in most instances they have no occasion for planting seeds; but I am quite sure that they are not opposed to the judicious and economical distribution of them among those who really will use them. I regret very much that it is not possible for me to send to my constituents other varieties of seeds than those contracted for by the department. I have a great number of calls for tobacco seed, different varieties of beans, different kinds of corn. I believe the Government could be helpful to the people in determining what character of seed would thrive best in the different communities, and if these seeds were furnished it is reasonable to suppose that good would result from it. Of course, this kind of distribution would be very expensive and probably impracticable to handle on a large scale, but I have heard no argument here to-day that will justify a discontinuance of the judicious distribution by Members of Congress of select varieties of garden seed. I have heard arguments which convinced me conclusively that the functions to be performed by Members of Congress in connec-

tion with their distribution have been sadly neglected in a great many districts. It seems that the fault is with us and not with the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of striking out the item altogether; it has, in my opinion, been carried too long. The Department of Agriculture, using money supplied by Congress, is doing remarkably good work in many lines, but some of its activities, forced upon it by Congress, are attracting unfavorable attention. They draw adverse criticism, not because they are not well done, but because they should never have been undertaken. Some of these activities are wrong in principle, in that they involve the performing of labor for the people that the people ought to do and are abundantly able to do for themselves; they involve the giving and supplying to the people things the people ought to provide for themselves.

These activities of doubtful propriety sometimes start with the department, due to the enthusiasm of bureau chiefs—very commendable enthusiasm if along right lines and within reasonable limits. The Constitution and decent regard for its limitations upon the duty and the authority of the Congress and the departments restrain enthusiasm to some extent; a scanty Treasury must now exert a vigorous restraint. But the Congress is itself largely at fault for starting improper lines of work and is altogether to blame for continuing them. The idea of distributing seeds began not so many years ago with an appropriation of \$1,000 for the importation and distribution of foreign seeds found to be suitable for growing in this country. Out of this worthy object and this modest appropriation the present debauch has grown. In time of food scarcity, as in time of war, a wide distribution of seeds may be proper, but during time of peace and normal production it is neither necessary nor justifiable. I question no man's motive, but a Member who believes the people need or very much wish free seeds—and for that reason only he votes this immense sum of money—should support the pending amendment which provides for sending out the seeds direct from the department and not under the Members' franks. But that amendment will not be adopted, showing plainly that those who oppose it wish their own names connected with the gift enterprise. I wish as much as anyone to please the people, certainly to supply their every need, but at this time of immense necessary expenditure, burdensome taxation, and certain deficit I can not vote, nor should the Congress vote, a quarter of a million dollars for an unnecessary if not an improper purpose.

I can see how men can vote for an appropriation of this kind who do not wish to economize in public expenditures. I can see how men can vote for this appropriation who feel no sense of responsibility for appropriations, but I can see no reason, nor is there a semblance of excuse, for such a vote by anyone who wishes to economize, especially by one who feels, or ought to feel, responsibility for what the Government is doing.

I trust the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] to strike out this item will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand the viewpoint of the gentlemen who grow so parsimonious and economical when it is proposed that the poor people and the farmers of this country shall have a little consideration shown to them in the bill. [Applause.] They are here talking pretendedly for economy and saving a little dab of \$150,000 or \$200,000 that we formerly appropriated for the purpose of increasing our production of the vegetables that go on the table of the people of this country, and yet the gentlemen who vote to cut out such appropriations and to economize jump up here and howl in favor of spending a billion and a half dollars for conscription and universal military training in times of peace, and howl in favor of spending millions of dollars for dockyards. Some Members have gotten up and bellowed at every item which has been presented in which the poor people of this country are respected by Congress, as in this case of a small appropriation for garden seeds for planting by the people in order that their children may have good wholesome vegetable food on the tables every day in the year.

These gentlemen come up with a howl for economy. Where is it that you propose to economize? Do you propose to take bread out of the mouths of the poor, to take vegetables out of the mouths of the little children in the towns and in the factory places? [Applause.] They plant gardens. The farmers plant gardens, and they want these fine seed from the Government. All you people like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is so busy in making points of no quorum and talking against the poor people of this country, waste so much time in that way that you can not find time to send out your garden seed. You are the people who are opposed to this appropriation. The poor people throughout the country certainly desire the seed from this Government to be sent to them directly by their Congressmen. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the remarks of gentlemen who have spoken here, who claim that the people throughout the country do not want the seeds, and who assert that those who do get them say they will not grow. My young friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] also inveighed against this proposition of sending out free garden seed. In one good long breath he wanted to abolish the seed distribution on the ground of economy, and in another good long breath he wanted the seed distribution to be made from the Department of Agriculture, and all in the name of economy. From that logic we could not decide whether he was outside trying to get in or inside trying to get out. [Laughter.]

But one thing I am sure of, and that is that the farmers of his district and the farmers of my district and the farmers of other districts would rather get a package of garden seeds from us than a speech. [Laughter.] At least I have had them send to me for garden seeds, but I have never had them send for a speech, and I am sure that that is the experience of the gentleman from Texas. [Laughter.]

Now, I will say to my young friend from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] that I was here when there was only one Republican on the floor of this House from Indiana; now all are Republicans, and seed have been going out every year. I am delighted to see him here, and I know he is going to stay, and when he has been here longer he will know more than he does now on the subject of these seeds. [Laughter.] It will not be long until he will be around trying to get some of my quota of seeds to send to the people in his district. And I will say to my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that when they get the wild and woolly Black Hills region of his State rolled down smooth enough so that things can be planted and grown there, there will come a demand for these seeds from that part of his State also. [Applause.]

My zeal in the interest of free seed is not that the rich cotton planter needs or may have them, nor that the owners of the vast wheat fields of the West need them, but that the owners of the countless modest homes in the towns and villages and countryside with attached gardens may have some share in the benefactions of our great Government, and it is my experience that nothing we have to send from here could be more beneficial to the folks of modest means than these seeds, nor could we do anything that will more greatly increase the yield of things that sustain human life, and which are more appreciated.

Therefore, in the presence of the fact that time more valuable twenty times over is weekly frittered away on this floor in attempted grand-stand displays and mediocre declamation for consumption at home than these seed will cost, I prefer to go on record for seed and the good people who want them as against the vocal unwindings that prove only a voice and suggest Hamlet's rebuke of Sage Polonius, "Words, words, words." [Applause.]

Mr. PURNELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, in listening to this argument I have come to the conclusion that I have one of the best districts in the United States, because there does not seem to be anybody out there poor enough up to this time to ask me to vote to appropriate money to buy garden seeds.

I have been against this garden-seed proposition ever since I have been in Congress, because I came to the conclusion that it was a useless waste of money. I have taken these garden seeds which have been assigned to me and have tried to do the best I could with them, because they were forced on me, and they belong to my district. The first year I advertised in all the

newspapers in the district that I would send garden seeds to anybody who asked for them. Those advertisements were copied in Ohio, Kentucky, and Illinois, and after being copied into all those papers I received less than 1,800 inquiries for garden seeds. Those requests I supplied. I then tried the proposition of sending out garden seeds to the newspapers. I did not get anywhere with that, and this year I thought I would try the other route, and I have mailed them to everybody in my district whose name I could get, and so far I have not received any particular praise or commendation for doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. I yield two minutes to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] who has made a miscalculation in his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana yields two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW]. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the Department of Agriculture, of course, was organized to encourage every phase of agricultural effort. And it is as clear as a cloudless sunrise that its organization and development have meant, indeed, not merely the sunrise but the sunburst of a new day in the rural life of America.

Having traveled rather widely in platform-lecture work before coming to Congress, I have had opportunity to see much of the farm-demonstration work going on, and I never meet these enterprising evangelists of agricultural education and inspiration but that I feel something of the same thrill that stirs me when I go among the departments here in Washington and see this great Government with all of its symmetrical ramifications of wonder-working activity—it makes me a truer American and a better patriot.

The Department of Agriculture is doing a wonderful work under its financial limitations—mark my words, financial limitations—for it is a startling cause for contemplation that, with an annual governmental expense account of over \$3,000,000,000, this Agricultural bill carries only about \$30,000,000, and one-third of this amount, bless you, goes to other objects than agriculture—forestry, roads, and so forth—causes highly necessary in themselves and tremendously worthy, but not an actual part of agricultural activities. In other words, only \$20,000,000 a year to encourage, to lead, and develop the most important industry—the foundation industry of all America.

And yet in face of this fact we find it necessary to vote for the Langley amendment to get the same amount for the distribution of seeds that we had last year, for the committee appropriation under the lash of the cry of retrenchment has been cut to only \$239,000 for the gardens and flower yards all over the Nation.

I recognize the fact that we must buckle on our armor, put our hands in our pockets like a brave, grateful people, and pay our war debt, and that therefore retrenchment is necessary in certain directions, but let us not begin at the gardens and even the very tables of the people. [Applause.]

I confess with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] that before I came to Congress I used to laugh at the sending of garden and flower seeds as a part of a Congressman's duty. "Send me some garden seeds," said some of my supporting friends as I started away to Washington. And it was said as a laughing joke. But since I came here and began to feel the pulse of the people—call it a desire to please the "dear people" and come back, if you will—my mail reveals the fact that there is a widespread interest among the masses in this garden and flower seed business.

I am still laughing away down inside of me about that remark of my witty and brilliant friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], when he declared that "our constituents are more anxious for these seeds than they are for our speeches." I have a confession to make. It punctures my pride, but here goes: Since I crawled off of bed where I stayed about seven years as the result of an accident while I was hauling wood as a farmer boy, I have been selling "hot air" for a living [laughter], and to tell the truth about it, I enjoy my speeches even if nobody else does. [Laughter and applause.] But I make here the distressing confession that I have received a hundred times more requests for garden and flower seeds than I have for my speeches. [Laughter and applause.]

Only a few days ago I sent 50 packages of seeds to one man, a superintendent of a factory, who said he wanted to encourage his employees to plant gardens in the burnt district of Atlanta and to make their homes more attractive by beautifying their yards with flowers.

This, gentlemen, is not politics, as has been suggested; it is patriotism; it is common sense; it is production; it is a part cure for the high cost of housekeeping; it is personal and national

economy; it is encouragement to the people at the very foundation of things.

BEECHER AND GRADY ON FLOWERS AND HOMES.

Henry Ward Beecher used to say that if he were traveling through a strange country and were looking for a place to stay all night he would keep on going until he found a house with flowers in the yard, for he knew that refinement and love must reign in the home where beautiful flowers smiled outside.

God smiled and the flowers bloomed,
Some poet grandly said,
And woman was the fairest flower
That raised her sun-crowned head.

Henry Grady declared in his great speech at the University of Virginia: "Teach a man that his sovereignty lies beneath his hat, link him to a spot of earth, and his loyalty will save the Republic when the drum tap is futile and the barracks are forever deserted."

And I love to think of the happy home of the plain, everyday citizen, the home that is his haven of rest and love and hope, surrounded by flowers of beauty and fragrance, all the more beautiful to him because of the deft and delicate touch of the noble little woman who is the wife of his bosom and the mother of his children—I love to think of him, I say, loyal defender of the flag that lifts its protecting folds above that happy home, coming home at nightfall and finding his wife standing with their laughing children amid the flowers that bloom about their home like the very smile of God, ready to give him the kiss of welcome that drives away "the cares that infest the day," and making him feel that for such a home he is ready to work and to live, and if need be to die. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House, I want this Government to do everything possible to link itself to the faith and the affections of that home. And if the flowers in that yard and the vegetables in that garden came largely from governmental help and encouragement it serves to make better patriots out of the boys and girls who planted them and feast upon them, and likewise of the father and mother who enjoy their beauty and their bounty. Every time a school boy or girl writes me for seed for the yard or the garden I send a letter seeking to encourage them in their worthy efforts. I thank God that I was reared by a father who taught me the wholesome doctrine that "every boy ought to know how a tired man feels"; and I know of nothing except the holy inspiration of a family altar that is more needed for the building of a steady stamina among the boys and girls of to-day than to encourage them to work—to work some every day—to beautify their home, to fructify their gardens, and to look with eager pride upon everything that brings happiness and prosperity to their parents, their home, their community, and their country.

HOME INDEPENDENCE A FOUNDATION NECESSITY.

And this thought is close akin to that other thought which is a foundation necessity in every home, and more especially in every farmer's home. I can never get over the feeling produced in my boyish heart by the incongruous picture of seeing some of our neighbors hauling hay and corn and meat by my father's home, which they had bought from some merchant in Marietta, Powder Springs, or Atlanta, who had agreed to "run" them with supplies to make their crop. And while farm demonstration and the farm-loan bank have done a great deal to help change this condition of dependence among the farmers, I still feel constrained, for the sake of those who have not yet become emancipated, to call all the farmers in the land before me, especially those in my own district, and issue to them this one ringing injunction "Live at home! Live at home! Live at home! Tax your genius and your industry to raise everything that the family needs at home, and your surplus will spell your financial independence!" Such a course will go a long way toward helping to solve many of the problems that confront and confound this Nation to-day. And as an encouragement to this good end I believe that the Department of Agriculture ought to be voted by this Congress a hundred millions instead of twenty millions a year. This Government can no longer afford to be "small" in its handclasp of encouragement to the man who feeds and clothes the world. [Applause.]

Mr. PURNELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, every day you will hear economy preached on the floor of this House, particularly by the Members on the other side. At the same time the majority of those who are preaching economy vote for every tomfool, unnecessary appropriation that comes before the House. I do not blame our Democratic friends for doing that, because when they vote for all these appropriations the expenditures of the Government are increased, and next fall they will go out in their campaign and criticize the "extravagant Republican Congress."

The facts are that the seed houses from which the Government secures these seeds send us those left from their sales of a year or two prior.

In the face of all that some of the Republicans on this side permit the wool to be pulled over their eyes.

Talk about the farmer wanting these seeds! I have a district that is a farming district. I have never received 10 requests from the farmers of my district. They do not want the seeds. The fact of the matter is that the people are very much mistaken as to the quality of these seeds. Seventy-five per cent of them will not grow. They are not fertile. The people believe that the Government has a great big farm where these seeds are produced. They think the seeds are absolutely all right because the Government raises them. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. LANGLEY. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has five minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield five minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], the Member from the Tombigbee district. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to participate in this discussion, and would not do so now but for the universal requests on both sides of the House, by both Democrats and Republicans that I do so, as they say it will be impossible to pass this provision presented by our committee in our bill now pending unless I submit my views on this great and important question. [Applause and laughter.]

You will always notice that this motion to strike out this and similar provisions is always made by some distinguished gentleman who is seeking to get into the class of statesmen, and who is serving his first term. They never make the motion after they serve more than one term in this House. So this motion as usual comes from a one-term. But the scales will drop from his eyes before his first term is out, and in the next Congress you will not hear a word from him on this subject, because he will hear from the people in the meantime, and somehow or other first-termers as well as long-termers will listen to the people when they speak, and ought at all times to do so. The voice of the people is mighty and should always prevail. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] said this was a pernicious practice. When did it become pernicious? He said the people do not want these seeds, although the requests for them come every day to every Member from all over the country. I dare say the gentleman from Indiana receives such requests himself practically every day. I picked up indiscriminately this morning this great bunch of requests I hold now in my hand that came to me to-day. They come in great numbers every day. The last one I happened to pick up, and here it is, says: "I am a little girl only 11 years old; I would thank you very much if you would send me some flower seeds."

These requests come from gentlemen and from ladies, from boys and from girls, and I ask you, my friend from Indiana, as I look into your face, handsome and intelligent as you are, can you turn a deaf ear to the voices of the little girls throughout the United States of America who want to plant these seeds, who are writing to you and to me and to others requesting us to send them? I do not believe you are so hard-hearted. If you, my dear friend, have any doubt as to what you should do, ask your courteous, chivalrous, handsome, and brilliant little son Fritz Purnell and he will tell you to vote for these little girls. He would vote for them if he was here and I now prophesy he will be here some day and have the opportunity to do so. [Applause.] The gentleman from Indiana said we were appropriating \$1,500,000 in this bill for farm extension. Yes, and under that appropriation the boys' and girls' clubs throughout the country are encouraged and largely formed, and they want these seeds and they utilize them, and they write to the Members of Congress for them. If you want to make this farm extension work popular and effective, there is no better way to do so than to send some of these seeds to the boys and girls composing these clubs. A lot of these seed can be utilized in that way. If you will calculate you will find that if this appropriation was paid for by the farmers themselves it would not cost as much as 1 cent apiece to the farmers throughout the country, and when it will be paid, not by the farmers alone, but by all the people, the cost is so infinitesimal it is impossible of calculation.

Will you take the little package of seed away from the gentlemen, ladies, boys, and girls who write for it when it is the only direct communication that they receive from the Government of the United States that goes to them individually and personally? [Applause.]

You talk about economy, and you want to economize by taking a small package of seed from the farmers of America. If that is the character and extent of the economy which you propose to practice you will not get very far with it. You had better go to work and save hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars in the large, and in some instances extravagant, appropriations, in which effort to save money I will join you, rather than to begin your economy by saving a few cents by taking these seeds from the farmers of the land.

The school gardens are places where you can accomplish great good by the distribution of seeds. It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that the value of the products that come from the school gardens in the United States of America amounts to millions of dollars each year. They further estimate that the value of the products grown from these seeds distributed by Congress amount to millions each year. So when you get down to the actual value of this investment the results mount up into millions. Therefore I say it should be continued and the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] to strike out the provision in the bill making this appropriation should be defeated, and I hope it will be. So long as my constituents, gentlemen, ladies, boys, and girls, want these seeds and show their desires by writing for them I want to send them to them. I am their servant here, and my earnest purpose, intention, and desire is at all times and in everything to represent the views of my constituents and respond to their requests on all occasions, and I believe my constituents will agree that I do so. [Applause.]

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of striking out this paragraph. This bill appropriates between thirty and forty millions of dollars for the legitimate interests of the farmer. This appropriation of \$250,000 is in the nature of a prize or grab-bag business, a gratuity to people who have no serious need for it whatever. I believe that if we are in earnest in striking out needless appropriations and wasteful expenditures, we can best begin with this item. This seed distribution does some good; but the good that it does is nowhere commensurate with the \$250,000 that we spend each year for the purpose. Some one has said here that the people like to have the seeds. Of course they do. They like to have anything they get free. If we should announce here that each constituent would be entitled to a dollar bill from his Congressman, there would be a general scramble for the gift, and all of them would be disappointed if we did not continue the practice. I am in favor of cutting out this item.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I realize that anything I may say in conclusion will not influence a single vote. There has been a great deal of facetious discussion in connection with this amendment, but the fact remains that to continue this appropriation for the distribution of congressional seeds is nothing more or less than cheap, legalized, congressional graft. I repeat this is the first opportunity we have had during the consideration of this bill to apply the acid test to those lip economists who preach economy but practice profligacy with the people's money. God have mercy upon your political souls; the people should not. I hope the amendment striking out the section will be agreed to and that we may start off with a new set of books in this hour of the Nation's financial crisis.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have had read for the information of the committee a proposed amendment. I now offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 9, strike out the figures "\$239,462" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$358,980."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. It is unauthorized by law and is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment simply increases the amount contained in the paragraph. No point of order having been made to the paragraph, a point of order does not now lie, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, is there another amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has offered an amendment for the information of the committee, which the Chair understands he intends to offer.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON and Mr. PURNELL) there were—ayes 87, noes 99.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LANGLEY and Mr. PURNELL to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 89, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 7, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to be." On page 31, line 8, strike out the words "addressed franks" and insert in lieu thereof "list of constituents, all of such seed to be mailed under frank of said department."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment would change existing law, which now provides the method of sending out these seeds. It would be new legislation on an appropriation bill, which is in contravention of the rules.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the present bill is an appropriation bill, and it seeks as has been done in some other appropriation bills to provide that seeds, as heretofore, shall be sent under congressional franks. That is not law. It is merely a provision on an appropriation bill. There is nothing on the previous appropriation bills to indicate that it was intended by Congress that this should become permanent law. Therefore, it is clearly a temporary provision on an appropriation bill which dies at the end of the year for which that appropriation bill was passed. In any event, it does not change fundamental law. It merely provides the means by which the Agricultural Department shall go about the distribution of public seeds. To say that because in a previous appropriation bill the Congress has seen fit to permit Representatives and Senators to send seeds out under their frank that therefore Congress has not the same right in a subsequent appropriation bill to provide for a different manner of distribution would be ridiculous. It is not a change of law. It merely provides the means whereby the distribution of the seeds may be made.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that it would change existing law, as it proposes to have the distribution made in a certain way, when existing law provides a different way. That is obviously new legislation and subject to the point of order. It seems to me that argument on the point is superfluous.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this provision is not permanent law. This provision does not seek to change the purpose and intent of the bill or the purpose and intent of the section. The purpose and intent of this section is the distribution of garden seeds by the Agricultural Department, not the distribution of garden seeds by the Members of Congress. This is an appropriation bill, a bill which applies particularly and specifically to the Agricultural Department. Surely the Chair will not hold that a provision providing that the Agricultural Department itself will distribute the seeds that naturally would come from that department is new legislation on an appropriation bill, the particular subject before the committee being the distribution of garden seed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, all of this part of the paragraph at least is legislation. It provides that five-sixths of all the seeds shall be allotted for distribution in the respective districts. It provides that Members of Congress shall furnish franked slips to the department for the department to send out the seeds. That is legislation of itself. It certainly is in order to provide that instead of Members of Congress sending franked slips to the Department of Agriculture they shall send lists to the Department of Agriculture. In fact I fail to see any substantial difference between the proposition in the bill and the proposition of the gentleman from Texas. In the one case the Department of Agriculture is furnished franked slips by the Members of Congress and pastes franked slips on the packages of seeds and mails them, and in the other case, as proposed by the gentleman from Texas, a Member of Congress furnishes a list of names, notifies his constituent that he has given the name of the constituent to the Department of Agriculture to receive a package of seeds, and the Department of Agriculture writes a franked slip and pastes it on the seed package and mails it. It is quite within the power of Congress to determine in a bill which of these methods shall prevail, and this being all legislation in the bill, it certainly is subject to an amendment to change the method of transacting this business from tweedledum to tweedledee.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit an inquiry?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. On May 19, 1902, Congress passed a resolution which provided that the Public Printer should furnish the Department of Agriculture such franks as the Secretary might require for sending out seeds on congressional orders, the franks to have printed thereon the facsimile of the signatures of the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates, and also the names of their respective States or Territories and such other printed matter as the Secretary may direct, the franks to be of such size, and so forth.

Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas provides that the seed shall be mailed under the frank of the Department of Agriculture. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if the amendment does not change the purpose and intent of the joint resolution of May 19, 1902, which provides for the printing of these slips with the Members' franks on them?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think so at all, Mr. Chairman. We provide by law for the printing of ordinary frank slips. We mail farmers' bulletins under frank slips. No one would contend that we would have to make an appropriation to print farmers' bulletins. No one will contend that because of that law providing for the printing of frank slips for sending out seed we have got to make appropriation for the seed at all. That is only a law covering a case when it arises, but if we do not authorize the sending of these seeds under Members' franks, of course, the law has no application. That is true, but there is nothing obligatory on Congress to say that seeds have to be sent that way. That is only in case a provision arises where Members send out the seeds themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to this phase of the situation. Rule XXI, section 2, provides that no legislation on an appropriation bill shall be in order which increases the amount of the appropriation or which on its face does not indicate a reduction in the amount to be appropriated. And I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the imposition of the work of addressing the slips and sending out the seeds, provided for in this section of the pending bill, will add materially to the expense of the Agricultural Department and thereby brings the amendment outside the rule.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would all have to be done under this appropriation by reducing the number of seed sent out, and I do not see how it would increase the expense of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MADDEN. It might increase the expense by compelling them to employ additional clerks, and then they would come to the Committee on Appropriations of the House for a deficiency.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They would have to meet all the expense out of the appropriation for this item.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not sure whether they would or not. My colleague would not deny that they would have the power to create a deficiency?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They would not have the power to create a deficiency.

Mr. MADDEN. If they did, then what?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If they created it, I do not know then what. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I just want the Chairman to take that into consideration in his decision.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As I understand, the matter read by the Chair provides certain specific legislation in reference to this seed distribution. It must be perfectly apparent that no amendment offered on the floor can repeal that law. If it changes it in any degree, that modifies the legislation, and on an appropriation bill it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] offers an amendment which, if adopted, will make the language in lines 7, 8, and 9, page 31, read as follows:

For distribution among their constituents, to be mailed by the department upon the receipt of their list of constituents, all of such seed to be mailed under the frank of said department in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine.

The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that that amendment is new legislation and changes existing law. The Chair has already called attention to the fact that on May 19, 1902, Congress passed a joint resolution, as follows:

That the Public Printer shall furnish to the Department of Agriculture such franks as the Secretary of Agriculture may require for sending out seeds on congressional orders, the franks to have printed thereon the facsimile signatures of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates, also the names of their respective States or Territories, and the words "United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional Seed Distribution," or such other printed matter as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct; the franks to be of such size and style as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; the expense of printing the said franks to be charged to the allotment for printing and binding for the two Houses of Congress.

That is found in 32 United States Statutes at Large, Public resolution 23.

It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois contends, that the language to which the amendment is offered provides for legislation, but it provides for legislation, in the view of the Chair, which is authorized under that resolution, namely, to provide for the sending out of the seeds, the franks for which are authorized to be printed upon requisition of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The amendment of the gentleman from Texas seeks to change the method of sending these seeds out under the addressed franks of the Members of Congress and Delegates, so that they shall be sent out under the frank of the said department. If the legislation to which the amendment is offered were subject to a point of order, and no point of order was lodged against it, any germane amendment would be in order to perfect it even though it might possibly repeal or modify the existing law. But, in the view of the Chair, the language of the bill is legislation which is authorized by existing law and is such legislation as would not be subject to a point of order, while the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is such as to amend, modify, and change what seems to the Chair to be the plain meaning and intent of the resolution which the Chair has read, and which is existing law, and would not be in order to this paragraph of the bill. That is to say it is new legislation, its effect being to change existing law in a manner which is hardly within the requirements of the rules of the House, relating to legislation on a general appropriation bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL], to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 71, yeas 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the pending bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MANN of Illinois having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, announced that the President had, on February 7, 1920, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern; and

H. R. 8953. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Forest Service: One forester, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, \$2,500; 1 inspector of records, \$2,400; 7 district fiscal agents, at \$2,120 each; 1 forest supervisor, \$3,240; 1 forest supervisor, \$2,880; 8 forest supervisors, at \$2,500 each; 16 forest supervisors, at \$2,380 each; 44 forest supervisors, at \$2,180 each; 60 forest supervisors, at \$1,980 each; 5 forest supervisors, at \$1,780 each; 1 deputy forest supervisor, \$1,980; 4 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,880 each; 25 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,780 each; 28 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,680 each; 15 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,580 each; 11 forest rangers, at \$1,620 each; 23 forest rangers, at \$1,520 each; 78 forest rangers, at \$1,420 each; 288 forest rangers, at \$1,320 each; 590 forest rangers, at \$1,220 each; 1 clerk, \$2,100; 4 clerks, at \$2,000 each; 19 clerks, at \$1,800 each; 21 clerks, at \$1,600 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 23 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,300 each; 138 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 95 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 54 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 30 clerks, at \$960 each; 122 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 clerk, \$600; 1 clerk or proof reader, \$1,400; 1 clerk or translator, \$1,400; 1 compiler, \$1,800; 1 draftsman, \$2,000; 2 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,800 each; 3 draftsmen, at \$1,600 each; 1 clerk or compositor, \$1,000; 3 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,600 each; 16 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,500 each; 6 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,400 each; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,500 each; 9 draftsmen, at \$1,400 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,300 each; 16 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,100 each; 3 draftsmen, at \$1,020 each; 1 draftsman, \$1,000; 1 draftsman, \$960; 12 draftsmen or map colorists, at \$900 each; 1 draftsman or artist, \$1,200; 1 draftsman or negative cutter, \$1,200; 1 artist, \$1,600; 1 artist, \$1,000; 1 photographer, \$1,600; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 photographer, \$1,100; 1 lithographer or photographer, \$1,200; 1 lithographer's helper, \$780; 1 blue printer, \$900; 1 blue printer, \$720; 2 telephone operators, at \$600 each; 1 machinist, \$1,260; 2 carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 3 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 1 carpenter, \$960; 1 electrician, \$1,020; 1 laboratory aid and engineer, \$1,000; 9 laboratory aids and engineers, at \$900 each; 2 laboratory aids and engineers, at \$800 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 1 laboratory helper, \$600; 1 packer, \$1,000; 1 packer, \$780; 4 watchmen, at \$840 each;

2 messengers or laborers, at \$960 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$900 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$780 each; 5 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messengers or laborers, at \$660 each; 5 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$540 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 13 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$540; 1 charwoman, \$480; 1 charwoman, \$300; 11 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$2,488,180.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 34, line 15, after the word "each," strike out the balance of the line, and all of lines 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, and down to and including the second "each" on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Ten messenger boys at \$600 a year."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, for the present, I object. I want to hear what the gentleman has to say, first.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to my good friend from Minnesota that I am still working on this useless messenger service. Saturday, when I offered amendments to cut down the messenger service in this bill from 743 messengers to 22, there followed a debate in which almost every participant admitted that there were too many messengers. And yet when the vote came we could get only 10 votes mustered in favor of retrenchment. I want to show my colleague from Minnesota what some of these gentlemen said.

Mr. MONDELL said:

It is no doubt true there are too many. Those of us who visit these departments believe there is an unnecessary number of clerks and probably an unnecessary number of messengers in many of them.

Then Mr. MANN of Illinois, the great leader on that side of the House, said:

Now, I am inclined to agree very largely with some of the suggestions made by the gentleman from Texas. I have no doubt there are too many messengers in the Agricultural Department and in every other department of the Government. The Committee on Agriculture has more important duties to perform than finding out what each one of the 700 messengers in the department is doing. I am inclined to think that it would not hurt anybody in the end if we very materially reduced the number of messengers, who are now so thick that they fall over each other in every department. [Applause.]

You will note that he received applause.

This is what Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, said:

There are too many employees. [Applause.] Why does the bill still provide for too many? Because the Committee on Agriculture was unable to get assistance or suggestions from heads of bureaus as to where cuts could properly be made in the bill, cuts that the majority of the committee said were necessary. * * * We could not eliminate the excess; we could not tell which clerk, which watchman, which messenger should be refused, and we received no suggestion from anyone connected with the department as to which of them could be eliminated. * * * And another thing that makes the number of employees in that department larger than it ought to be is that every one of them is under civil service, and time after time the heads of the bureau, in answer to inquiries, have told us that there are clerks and other employees on the rolls who are incompetent. We asked why incompetents are not dismissed, and the answer was that they are under civil service; that if one is to be gotten rid of there must be charges and a trial, so the bureau hesitates, and that is one of the reasons they do not proceed against anyone.

Now, from Mr. MADDEN, the majority sage on departmental affairs—I will read what he says on pages 2611 and 2612 of the RECORD:

I think that it will be admitted by every man here that if there ever was a time when we should pare to the bone that time is now. It is conceded by every impartial observer that in all the branches of the Government service in the District of Columbia we have more than 40,000 people who are not needed, but you can not get the cooperation of any man in the Government service to eliminate them from the pay roll. * * * And I am perfectly willing to enter upon a campaign now to assist in the elimination of every unnecessary employee.

Mr. BLANTON. Then vote for my amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I will. I intend to vote for the gentleman's amendment. * * * We had about 30,000 people on the pay roll in Washington when the war came on, and to-day we have 110,000. Does anyone believe that 110,000 clerks are needed here in these days of peace? Not at all.

Now, let us see what was said by Mr. HAUGEN, the chairman of this committee. Here is what he says on page 2612 of the RECORD:

It was suggested to a representative of the department that he might indicate what cuts could best be made in the bill. He indicated that he would like to accommodate the committee, but I inferred that it would be embarrassing to him to suggest a cut in one bureau and not in another. * * * The committee can not go to the departments to find out how many messengers they must employ and how many they need. We must take their word for it. * * * We may have more messengers here than we ought to have, and I think they have more in the departments than they ought to have.

Now, let us see what Mr. TILSON, the expert parliamentarian from Connecticut, says about this matter on page 2613 of the RECORD:

Contrary to what has been done in most other cases, this particular item has been increased and the number of employees as well in a considerable number of instances. This item in 1918 carried \$418,000 plus; in 1919 it carried \$440,000 plus; in 1920, the current law, it carries \$491,000 plus, a jump of \$50,000; and now in this bill there is another jump of over \$35,000 in this one item. If we ever intend to get back to normal, to anything like where we were before the war, it is necessary not only to not increase but to cut wherever possible.

Mr. Chairman, despite all of the above lip-expressions of economy, I say when we went to vote on the matter, when we got down to a vote, one would be inclined to think, from all of these statements of these big leaders on this Republican economy side, that that amendment for retrenchment would carry. Yet when it came to a vote, so that these messengers could be reduced in this bill, there were only 10 votes for it in the committee. Not a single leader asked that these 367 absent Members be brought in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more, because this is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman used up all of his time in reading matter that was already in the RECORD, and therefore I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. NOLAN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to continue for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to continue for two minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, why do they object? Because these employees are civil-service employees of this Government, and whenever you go to take one off you have got the organization of that gentleman who prevented me from extending my remarks [Mr. NOLAN] coming up here and bulldozing Congress. That is why you see in the paper this morning the pronouncement of his organizations, who say to the country that they are going to elect every Congressman to do their bidding, as the gentleman from California does so frequently in their behalf. That is the greatest menace that was ever sounded to the danger of this great Republic.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am glad to have seen Mr. Gompers's hand, because it is going to wake up the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and whenever Samuel Gompers puts his hand on a Representative and says, "Elect him," the people are going to keep him at home. That will be the result of this great pronouncement from the man who wants free speech, the man who wants free press. He is the gentleman who objects to Members of Congress going to the American people with these things that are of the utmost importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HAUGEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire recognition?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes. The bill carries 36 messengers here, but the service is divided into eight districts and 151 national forest units. It would seem that the 36 messengers are not an unusually large number of messengers. When you take into consideration the amount of money expended and the receipts of the service, I think the gentleman will agree that the number asked for is a reasonable number.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I objected to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to extend his remarks. I do not object to anybody getting

up on the floor of this House and talking about matters that are pertinent to the subject before the House, but I am going to object to any Member of this House taking up page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with extensions of remarks—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

Mr. NOLAN (continuing). Especially when it is hypocrisy and demagoguery.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from California may have five minutes. The gentleman from Texas had five minutes. I did not make a point of order on the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I shall not object unless the gentleman is too contrary. In that connection I ask that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. NOLAN. I will agree to that, unless the gentleman's remarks are not in connection with the subject that I objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am sorry that the gentleman from Texas objects, because he himself has just spoken for five minutes out of order. I did think of making a point of order against him when he was speaking. I do not think he ought to object to the gentleman replying to him—the gentleman whom he attacked.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from California spoke on precisely the same subject as the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made that the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is not discussing the amendment he proposed. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be permitted to speak five minutes out of order, and that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division of the request.

Mr. BLANTON. I am perfectly willing for the request to be divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The House can not intelligently act on requests for unanimous consent until they are stated by the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to modify my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will wait until the Chair states the original request. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] be permitted to proceed for five minutes out of order, and that the gentleman from Texas himself be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for a division of the request.

Mr. BLANTON. And as it is modified, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from California be permitted to address the House out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks to modify his request as submitted, so that it will provide that the gentleman from California be permitted to address the House out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. NOLAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the gentleman is going to revise and extend his remarks—

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana objects. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is as fair as we get.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the House in trying to answer the references made by the

gentleman from Texas to myself. I have been here since 1913, and my record is well known to the workers of the country and well known to the Members of Congress and to people generally who take notice of the proceedings in the House and who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What I object to is the action of the gentleman from Texas or any other Member in abusing the privileges of the House by revising and extending remarks as a Member of Congress. I do not object so much to the extension of remarks, even when he goes to the newspapers and the magazines and inserts material and communications from his constituents and others. But I do object to the method adopted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], not once but on many occasions, in attacking myself and others through the grant of the privilege of extension of remarks, by putting stuff into the RECORD that he does not utter on the floor of this House. That is why I intend to object whenever I am in this House when the gentleman from Texas asks permission to revise and extend his remarks. Last summer he attacked the Committee on Labor and he attacked the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACCRATE], and myself through an extension of remarks of 32 pages, which I attempted to answer and did answer under date of September 16 by putting into the RECORD, over the protest of the gentleman from Texas, communications that I and other Members of this House had received. Now, I am an advocate of free speech, but I want it to be free speech and I want a man when he attacks anybody to attack him to his face and not steal into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD like a thief in the night behind his back.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman directed that appellation to me, I ask that his words be taken down.

Mr. NOLAN. I take it there is no question as to whom I referred to.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I ask that the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will indicate the words that he desires to have taken down.

Mr. BLANTON. The words about coming into the RECORD like a thief in the night.

The CHAIRMAN. The words will be taken down.

Mr. BLANTON. I think I am pretty open-mouthed in what I say.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will suspend. The Official Reporters will write out the words, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

I want a man when he attacks anybody to attack him to his face and not steal into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, like a thief in the night, behind his back.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise and report the words to the House.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 12272, the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] having the floor, uttered words which, upon the demand of Mr. BLANTON, were taken down; and said words having been taken down and reported to the committee, he reported the words to the House for its action.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be expunged from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the words be expunged from the RECORD.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP), there were—ayes 17, noes 72.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members—

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, to save the time of the House, may I be permitted to withdraw the remark which I made?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California requests that he be permitted to withdraw the words.

Mr. HICKS. I make the point of order that the Chair has announced that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair has already announced the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman said he would withdraw the words.

Mr. HICKS. But the Chair has announced that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Chair had announced it. The Chair thinks it is too late, after the announcement that no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will, as their names are called, vote "yea," those opposed "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 70, nays 186, answered "present" 27, not voting 145, as follows:

YEAS—70.

Ayres	Eagan	Mann, S. C.	Saunders, Va.
Bee	Eagle	Minahan, N. J.	Smithwick
Black	Evans, Mont.	Montague	Steagall
Blackmon	Fisher	Oldfield	Stedman
Bland, Va.	Goodwin, Ark.	Oliver	Stoll
Brand	Hoey	Olney	Taylor, Colo.
Briggs	Hudspeth	Overstreet	Thomas
Brinson	Jacoway	Park	Tillman
Buchanan	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Upshaw
Byrns, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Pell	Vinson
Collier	Jones, Tex.	Phelan	Weaver
Connally	Kitchin	Pou	Weitz
Crisp	Lankford	Quin	Wilson, La.
Dent	Loneragan	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Dickinson, Mo.	McAndrews	Raker	Woods, Va.
Dominick	McClintic	Rayburn	Wright
Doughton	McDuffie	Robinson, N. C.	
Dupré	Major	Romjue	

NAYS—186.

Ackerman	Foster	Linthicum	Rose
Almon	Frear	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Anderson	French	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Sanford
Ashbrook	Gandy	Luhling	Schall
Babka	Gard	McArthur	Scott
Bacharach	Glynn	McCulloch	Sherwood
Baer	Good	McKenzie	Shreve
Barbour	Goodall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Benham	Goodykoontz	Madden	Sinnott
Bland, Ind.	Graham, Ill.	Magee	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Mo.	Green, Iowa	Mann, Ill.	Smith, Ill.
Boles	Griest	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Hadley	Martin	Snell
Brooks, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Mason	Steenerson
Browne	Harrell	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Burroughs	Haugen	Merritt	Stephens, Ohio
Caldwell	Hawley	Michener	Stiness
Campbell, Pa.	Hays	Miller	Strong, Kans.
Carss	Hernandez	Monahan, Wis.	Strong, Pa.
Chindblom	Hersey	Mondell	Summers, Wash.
Christopherson	Hersman	Mooney	Sweet
Classon	Hickey	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Coady	Hicks	Moore, Ind.	Thompson
Cole	Hill	Morgan	Tilson
Cooper	Hoch	Mott	Tincher
Crago	Houghton	Mudd	Tinkham
Crowther	Huddleston	Murphy	Valle
Currie, Mich.	Hutchinson	Nelson, Mo.	Vare
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Nelson, Wis.	Vestal
Dale	Jefferis	Nichols, Mich.	Voigt
Davey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Walters
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Pa.	Peters	Ward
Dewalt	Kahn	Platt	Wellington
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Purnell	Wheeler
Dowell	Keller	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Ramsey	Williams
Echols	Kendall	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Elliott	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Wis.	Wingo
Ellsworth	Kless	Reavis	Winslow
Emerson	Klecza	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Evans, Nebr.	Lampert	Rhodes	Yates
Evans, Nev.	Langley	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Fairfield	Layton	Robison, Ky.	Zihlman
Focht	Lea, Calif.	Rodenberg	
Fordney	Leibach	Rogers	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—27.

Bankhead	Garner	Lanham	Padgett
Begg	Griffin	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Blanton	Hardy, Tex.	Leshner	Small
Box	Harrison	McKeown	Summers, Tex.
Candler	Hayden	McKinley	Walsh
Drane	Hull, Tenn.	Mansfield	Young, Tex.
Fields	Humphreys	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—145.

Andrews, Md.	Clark, Fla.	Freeman	Igoe
Anthony	Clark, Mo.	Fuller, Mass.	James
Aswell	Cleary	Gallagher	Johnston, N. Y.
Barkley	Copley	Gallivan	Juul
Bell	Costello	Ganly	Kelley, Mich.
Benson	Cramton	Garland	Kennedy, Iowa
Booher	Cullen	Garrett	Kettner
Bowers	Dallinger	Godwin, N. C.	Kincheloe
Britten	Darrow	Goldfogle	King
Browning	Dempsey	Gould	Kinkaid
Brumbaugh	Denison	Graham, Pa.	Knutson
Burdick	Donovan	Greene, Mass.	Kraus
Burke	Doelling	Greene, Vt.	Kreider
Butler	Doremus	Hamill	Larsen
Byrnes, S. C.	Dunbar	Hamilton	Lazaro
Campbell, Kans.	Dyer	Hastings	Little
Cannon	Edmonds	Heflin	McFadden
Cantrill	Elston	Holland	McGlennan
Caraway	Esch	Howard	McKinley
Carew	Ferris	Hulings	McLane
Carter	Fess	Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Casey	Flood	Husted	McPherson

MacCrate	Porter	Sears	Timberlake
MacGregor	Rainey, Ala.	Sells	Towner
Maher	Rainey, H. T.	Siegel	Treadway
Mead	Randall, Calif.	Sims	Venable
Moon	Reber	Sisson	Wason
Moore, Va.	Reed, N. Y.	Slemp	Watkins
Morin	Riddick	Smith, N. Y.	Watson
Neely	Riordan	Snyder	Webster
Newton, Minn.	Rouse	Steele	Whaley
Newton, Mo.	Rowan	Stevenson	White, Me.
Nicholls, S. C.	Rowe	Sullivan	Wilson, Pa.
O'Connell	Rucker	Swope	Wood, Ind.
O'Connor	Sabath	Tague	
Ogden	Sanders, La.	Taylor, Ark.	
Parker	Scully	Taylor, Tenn.	

So the motion to strike out the words was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.
 Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. ESCH with Mr. SIMS.
 Mr. TOWNER with Mr. GARRETT.
 Mr. PARKER with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. ASWELL.
 Mr. TIMBERLAKE with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.
 Mr. CANNON with Mr. SISSON.
 Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. WASON with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. REBER with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. GALLAGHER.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. CARTER.
 Mr. REED of New York with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. DENISON with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. BENSON.
 Mr. KINKAID with Mr. WHALEY.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. WEBSTER with Mr. CANTRELL.
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. SELLS with Mr. CAREY.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. JUUL with Mr. HOLLAND.
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. FESS with Mr. HOWARD.
 Mr. SLEMP with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BARKLEY.
 Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. CLEARY.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
 Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. VENABLE.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. KRAUS with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. WATKINS.
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. STEVENSON.
 Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. JAMES with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. DUNBAR with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. ELSTON with Mr. LAZARO.
 Mr. BROWNING with Mr. HEFLIN.
 Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. DYER with Mr. IGOE.
 Mr. DARROW with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. LARSEN.
 Mr. BURDICK with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. KING with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. OGDEN with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. McFADDEN with Mr. ROUSE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to strike out the words is not agreed to. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumed consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12272), with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] has three minutes remaining.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up any more time. I rose and got five minutes out of order for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the reasons why I objected to an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. If this little performance here for the last three-quarters of an hour does nothing else than tend to correct that sort of an abuse, I am satisfied with my part in it. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard to-day references to organized labor in politics, that the members of labor unions are going to combine to support their friends or alleged friends, regardless of political party affiliations. While this is nothing new in this country, if it means the subordination of vital political principles to class solidarity it is to be regretted. Class hatred should be minimized and avoided. Representative government is founded on mutual regard and confidence. All people, whether they work with hands or brain, are useful and necessary to the happiness of all. Nor should any movement be founded upon the idea that one class owns the property and another does the work. The working people own more of the funds deposited in savings institutions, banks, trust and insurance companies than any other class. To destroy the institution of private property would not increase the well-being of those who labor, but would injure them.

I commend to all thinking people these words of Abraham Lincoln:

LINCOLN ON PROPERTY.

Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BLAND of Indiana, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Mr. FAIRFIELD, Mr. PURNELL, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. STEENERSON were given leave to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 34, line 15, after the word "each," strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, down to and including the second "each" in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "10 messenger boys at \$600 each."

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigation and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$1,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter the charge for grazing permits upon each of the national forests shall be not less than the appraised value of pasturage upon such national forests as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time, but at least every five years, beginning with the calendar year 1921, upon the basis of the commercial rates charged for pasturage upon lands of similar character, taking into account the advantages and disadvantages of the respective areas: *And provided also*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may allow free of charge the grazing of milk, work, or other animals used for domestic purposes not exceeding a total of 10 head owned and in use by bona fide settlers residing in or near a national forest; or animals in actual use by prospectors, campers, and travelers; or saddle, pack, and work animals actually used in connection with permitted operations on the national forests. To pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forests products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, office fixtures, law books, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and

for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso beginning with line 13, page 35, and ending with the word "areas," in line 21, page 35.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve a point of order on the balance of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order on the second proviso, on page 35, lines 13 to 21, inclusive, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves a point of order on the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. FRENCH. I reserve a point of order on the words in line 18, page 35, "beginning with the calendar year 1921."

The CHAIRMAN. They are included in the reservation of the point of order of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. FRENCH. It is conceivable that the point of order I have made may apply to those words, while the points of order made by others may not apply to the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event the gentleman will be recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. I want to inquire of the committee why it is that they attempt, as they state in their report, to double the grazing fees on the national forests, beginning with the year 1921, by the enactment of this proviso, when it was set forth in the hearings by the Chief of the Forest Service that there are now in existence on most of the national forests a series of five-year permits which began with the year 1919 and will not expire until the year 1923? To enact such legislation at this time is unfair and unjust to a large number of stockmen who, acting upon the announced policy of the Secretary of Agriculture, accepted a doubling of the grazing fees for the year 1919 with the distinct understanding that they could obtain five-year permits, which they have since obtained. On page 127 of the hearings appears a letter dated November 23, 1918, addressed to the Secretary of the National Live Stock Association, in Denver, by the Secretary of Agriculture, which reads in part:

On a considerable portion of the national forests we have reached the point where permits for a period of five years can be put into effect without difficulty. * * * Therefore I am authorizing the forester to issue five-year grazing permits, beginning with the season of 1919, where the conditions warrant such action and it is desired by the permittees.

It is set forth in the testimony of Mr. A. F. Potter, the associate forester, that there are now in existence a large number of such five-year permits. Certainly it is unfair and unjust to the cattle growers and sheep raisers on the national forests to attempt now, in the light of the existing understanding, by legislation, to arbitrarily double the grazing fees they will have to pay. I want to know what it was that induced the committee to recommend such radical action.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language of the item is such that if we had not put that in they would have had to begin immediately, and we thought we would be more lenient than otherwise by making it 1921 instead of right away.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman is well aware, as were other members of the committee, of the existence of this five-year agreement respecting grazing fees on the national forests. Why not wait to apply the raise until 1923, as suggested by Mr. Potter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has the floor. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman desires an answer to his question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have a copy here of the blank form of permits, and if the gentleman will examine it he will find that they reserve the right to terminate the lease at any time.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true of every grazing permit that was ever issued on any national forest reserve. That is the reason why forest-reserve grazing permits are not as valuable as leases obtained on private grazing lands. The stockman can not afford to pay as much for a privilege which is revocable at any time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Very well, then. You have no five-year permit, because the Government reserves the right to revoke it.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will let me give the history of this matter, I am sure that he will agree with my statement of the facts. In the years 1916 and 1917 the Forest Service

made an investigation of the charges for grazing on private and Indian lands adjacent to the national forests, and decided that the rates charged on the forest reserves were not high enough. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1917 proposed to double the grazing fees. The stockmen were heard on the question, and they said that they would not object to doubling the fees provided that they were given five-year permits instead of the then prevailing permits which ran from year to year. It was with that distinct understanding that the raise in rates was made. In 1918 there was a 25 per cent increase, and last year, 1919, the Secretary of Agriculture enforced a 100 per cent increase. Over \$880,000 in increased collections was paid into the Treasury by virtue of that increase. Now, in the middle of the term of the existing five-year agreements, the committee proposes by legislation to redouble the grazing fees on the national forests and increase the collections from the stockmen by \$2,500,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, we have a statement from the Chief Forester stating that no obligation has been incurred on the part of the Government as to the tenure of the permit. The gentleman has referred to the fees charged. If the gentleman will turn to the hearings, he will find that we turned over 155,000,000 acres of land to the department with forest, grazing, and water-power privileges included. Yet the expenditures for the Forest Service are \$9,285,611 and the receipts only \$4,358,414, leaving a deficit of \$4,927,196. It seems to me that it is time that we were giving more consideration to the question of receipts from the forests. The grazing fees last year were for the entire year on an average \$1.20 per head of cattle; sheep, 25 per cent less; horses, 25 per cent increase. The average fees received for cattle were 72 cents per head.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman compare the fees charged for cattle and the different kinds of stock upon our national forests with those charged in Canada? Is it not a fact that we charge almost double what they do, and in some cases two and a half times and three times as much?

Mr. HAUGEN. We may charge less than Canada, but we charge only half in the forests that they charge outside the forests under similar conditions. It is time to look into this matter and to charge a reasonable fee.

Mr. SINNOTT. Has the gentleman the figures to answer my question?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have the figures charged by the department and the figures charged outside of the forests.

Mr. SINNOTT. The figures I have from the department show that we charge two and a half and sometimes three times as much as they charge across the line.

Mr. HAUGEN. In Canada?

Mr. SINNOTT. For the same kind of grazing.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not concerned over the fees in Canada, but I am concerned over the fees in this country.

Mr. SINNOTT. It affords a pretty good comparison.

Mr. HAUGEN. And I am concerned about the condition of the Treasury at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have here a letter from the Acting Forester, Mr. A. F. Potter, in which he states that the total receipts for grazing on the national forests last year were \$2,609,000, and that the total expenditures of all kinds, including payments to the States, were \$1,576,000, leaving a clear profit on the grazing of \$1,032,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I suggest to the gentleman that they confine themselves to the point of order. The merits of the proposition are not in issue at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserved the point of order for the purpose of securing information. He proceeded under the five-minute rule, which is permissible until the regular order is demanded.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman from Michigan is anxious for action, and inasmuch as the hour of adjournment is close at hand, I make the point of order that this proviso is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the language, beginning with the words "Provided further," in line 13, down to and including the word "areas," in line 21, is new legislation. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. It would seem that if the Forest Service has jurisdiction over grazing and Congress has jurisdiction over the Forest Service, that Congress has also the right to prescribe how the permits shall be made and how the amount of the fees shall be reached. The courts have determined that the Forest Service has the power to fix the fees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order which I make is that under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to fix the grazing fees on the national forests, and that this proposed legislation is a change of existing law, directing the manner in which such fees shall be collected. It is also an attempt to raise revenue on an appropriation bill, and does not carry any reduction of expenditures. The precedents are very clear. Only a few days ago—on the 26th of January, to be exact—a decision in point was rendered when the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill was under consideration. An amendment was offered to increase the fees for passports from \$1 to \$5. The Speaker at that time held:

By the terms of the amendment it is provided that an additional fee—in other words, additional revenue—shall be provided, which shall be put into the same fund from which this appropriation is drawn, and which increases that fund by the amount derived from the tax.

It is a novel suggestion that new taxes are economy or lead necessarily to a reduction of expenses.

The point of order was sustained.

A ruling to the same effect was made by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. MADDEN, of Illinois, who said:

It must be apparent to the members of the committee that there is nothing on the face of this amendment to indicate a reduction in the amount of the appropriation. Of course, it is true that if the amendment should be adopted it would raise revenue, but the revenue would go into the Treasury, to the credit of the general fund; and there is nobody here wise enough to say what that revenue would be appropriated for. It might not be appropriated for the payment of the expenses of the State Department at all; and on the face of the facts, as the Chair sees them, he can not see any possibility of the reduction of the amount of the appropriation on its face resulting from the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, nor can it be said that it will even increase the amount covered into the Treasury. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

There can be no question but that this proviso attempts to change existing law by legislation on an appropriation bill; and therefore violates the terms of clause 2 of rule 21, which prohibits that very thing from being done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only a word. There is authority of law for the Secretary making the charge for the use of the national forests for grazing and for other purposes. He has been pursuing one plan under that general authority. This is a suggestion or a direction to him to use another plan. It seems to me that this is not subject to the point of order.

It is his duty to make some charge, and he has been pursuing one plan and we are suggesting to him to use another.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will yield.

Mr. HAWLEY. Undoubtedly the Congress has the right to regulate charges for grazing, and it has exercised that right by giving the Secretary certain discretion in law, but that was a matter of general law. That discretion can not obtain on legislation on an appropriation bill. If the committee would bring in special legislation changing that, undoubtedly it would be in order for the committee to make such changes, but it is not in order to report legislative changes in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona has made a point of order on the proviso beginning in line 13, page 35. I reserve a point of order on the balance. I desire, in connection with the point of order made by the gentleman from Arizona, as it is practically a part of it, to make a point of order on the proviso beginning on line 21, page 35, down to and including the word "forests," lines 3 and 4, page 36, and let it all go together. I do not think there can be any argument as to whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to discuss the point of order?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the point of order made by the gentleman from Arizona covers language to which the point of order offered by myself was directed.

It seems to me that either point of order must be sustained under our rules, and I have in mind especially section 2 of Rule XXI, which provides that no change may be made upon appropriation bills of existing law, except as is germane to the subject matter of the bill and shall retrench expenditures. To my mind the provision included in the bill as reported by the committee, that attempts to define a policy for the fixing of grazing-permit charges and providing that this policy shall begin with the calendar year 1921, is clearly out of order, and it has been

repeatedly decided by the Chair that language much less constructive than this is not in order.

Now let me refer for just a few minutes to the merits of the committee proposition. The committee proposes that hereafter charges for grazing permits upon each national forest shall be not less than approved value of pasturage upon such forests as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time, and at least every five years, beginning with the calendar year 1921, upon the basis of commercial rates charged for pasturage upon lands of similar character, taking into account the advantages and disadvantages of the respective areas.

In a general way the language of the proposed measure recites a policy that the department desires to follow.

Prior to 1906 no charge was made for grazing live stock upon the national forests. Although the number of each kind of stock was restricted and only limited numbers permitted to graze, the grazing privilege was allowed free in accordance with the prevailing custom upon the public lands.

The policy of charging for grazing permits was put into effect on January 1, 1906, and the rates first established were from 35 to 50 cents per head for grazing cattle and horses during the entire year and from 20 to 35 cents per head for the regular summer grazing season. The charge for sheep and goats was from 5 to 8 cents per head for the regular summer grazing season, no year-long grazing of these kinds of stock being allowed at that time.

The rates initiated in 1906 were readjusted and gradually increased during the first 10 years, with the result that on January 1, 1916, the charge for grazing cattle during the entire year had been increased from 40 cents to \$1.50 per head in accordance with the advantages of the locality, and these rates were used as the basis for rates on other kinds of stock and for grazing periods of less than one year. The charge for horses was fixed at 25 per cent more than for cattle and the charge for sheep and goats at 25 per cent of the cattle rate. The charge for periods of less than one year was generally one-tenth of the annual rate per month.

Under these different schedules the average amount paid by the stockmen for their grazing permits was increased approximately 50 per cent between 1906 and 1916 and considerably more up to the last year, or 1919.

Under these different schedules and policies the total receipts from grazing on the national forests have increased from \$513,000 in 1906, with an area of 94,159,492 acres, to \$1,210,214 in 1916, with an area of 156,706,008 acres, and to \$2,609,169 in 1919, with approximately the same acreage. There has been, proportionate with the area, an increase of about 50 per cent in the number of stock grazed.

In connection with the final increase the announcement was made that five-year permits would be issued, which would not be subject to reduction except to stop damage to the forest. Such permits have been issued for about two-thirds of the stock grazed upon the forests, and with the understanding that the present rates would apply until the end of the five-year period, in 1923. This action was taken to stabilize the live-stock industry and encourage expansion and improvement by small owners, who hesitated to borrow money for the purchase of additional stock or better animals without assurance regarding the future obligations they would have to meet. A change in the rates, applicable prior to the calendar year 1924, would necessitate a readjustment in these permits.

Those to whom these permits have been issued have made their business arrangements on the assumption that the leases have been issued in good faith. Under them men have acquired by purchase or by lease lands for winter use. They have constructed buildings. They have purchased breeding stock and shaped and modified their herds and flocks upon the basis, not of one year, or an uncertain period, but on the basis of five years.

These permits are necessarily part of the basis for the establishment of credit, and you can see what it would mean to those who hold them to tear them in two as a mere scrap of paper, and to say to those who hold them, "We shall renew your leases provided you will enter into a new lease upon the basis of 50 per cent or 100 per cent increase in rates to the Government." Gentlemen, a proposition of that kind can not be defended, and those who hold leases from the Government on forest reserves have the right to expect that, excepting for the most urgent reason, their leases shall be held sacred for the period of time recited in the lease. The reason why it appeared advisable to fix a period of five years was in order to encourage the stock industry on the forest reserves. Men would not go into the stock business and then be dispossessed at an uncertain time. It is to the interest of the Government to encourage a policy that will mean permanent industry, and it is to the interest of those

who engage in the business to know definitely the time for which their leases shall apply.

The provision of the bill suggested by the Committee on Agriculture should be eliminated, for the Secretary of Agriculture has all the authority that it confers, but if not eliminated it should be made to apply upon the expiration of permits that are outstanding and not be made to terminate current permits regardless of the responsibility assumed by those who are engaged in the stock business by virtue of these contracts or permits made by the Government.

I want to insert in my remarks at this point a table prepared by the Forest Service that will show the permits that are outstanding (1919) for grazing upon the forest reserves.

Grazing permits issued and number of stock grazed.

State.	Cattle, horses, and swine.				Sheep and goats.		
	Permits issued.	Number of stock grazed.			Permits issued.	Number of stock grazed.	
		Cattle.	Horses.	Swine.		Sheep.	Goats.
Alabama.....	2	59					
Arizona.....	1,570	560,011	6,509	637	160	364,853	6,604
Arkansas.....	452	4,591	80	494	15	49	230
California.....	3,021	208,683	7,019	3,324	551	606,526	13,286
Colorado.....	4,455	380,460	9,503		872	1,044,208	1,322
Florida.....	23	787		6			
Georgia.....	48	440	14	15	3	23	
Idaho.....	4,213	190,608	13,794		1,093	1,758,877	
Michigan.....					2	91	
Montana.....	2,865	170,674	16,524		521	835,224	131
Nebraska.....	54	12,757	713				
Nevada.....	502	77,432	4,320		109	390,753	
New Hampshire.....	15	138	12				
New Mexico.....	2,020	174,979	5,309	467	576	440,302	39,051
North Carolina.....	186	1,157	52	56	5	82	
Oklahoma.....	57	3,304	294				
Oregon.....	2,478	162,004	10,066	88	537	753,418	52
South Dakota.....	786	38,185	3,184		8	12,200	
Tennessee.....	47	431			5	75	
Utah.....	7,249	172,246	9,914	67	1,641	811,510	110
Virginia.....	273	2,614	15		1	6	
Washington.....	1,031	30,743	2,318		196	236,307	
Wyoming.....	1,181	143,204	3,611		329	680,670	
Total.....	32,528	2,135,527	93,251	5,154	6,624	7,935,174	60,789

SOME OBJECTIONS.

Time will not permit a full answer to every criticism that has been made.

One gentleman says that the average cost of grazing in the forest reserves is 72 cents per head of cattle for a season and one-fourth of that for sheep. And then he says that in Kansas and Iowa for the same use of pasture owners of stock are glad to pay \$14 per head of cattle. Another Member declares that the rates on the forest reserves are one-tenth what they ought to be while others would pass immediately an act multiplying the rates charged by 300 per cent.

Gentlemen forget that the Kansas and Iowa lands of which they speak will sell for \$50 to \$100 per acre, while the forest-reserve lands that carry the most stock would not sell probably for \$5 an acre if offered to the highest bidder.

Again, gentlemen forget that Kansas and Iowa lands are close to market, that on stock shipped from there there is little shrinkage in shipment, that stock may be shipped at almost any time and thus be able to meet the top-notch price, that fields are fenced, that water is abundant, and that herds do not require the constant attention of the cowboys and the sheep herders. Gentlemen forget that all these items add greatly to the expenses of the stockmen in the Western States.

Gentlemen forget that a generation ago for the most part predatory animals were killed off in the Middle States, while here is a problem that means annual loss to the stockmen who depend on the forest range.

But after all the chief reason why the committee proposition should not pass is because it annuls existing permits. The Government's word should be good. Agreements should be kept and men to whom have been granted permits for a definite period should not be disturbed in rights that exist under them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, it may not reduce the expenditures, but it will increase the receipts. It will really increase them by more than \$2,000,000. It means more than \$900,000 in revenue for the States and it means \$1,000,000 revenue for the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona makes the point of order to the second proviso of this paragraph, in that

it changes existing law and is legislation on an appropriation bill. Clearly the language of the proviso is in the form of permanent legislation, and as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] suggested, it seeks to provide specifically what is now by law given to the Secretary of Agriculture as a discretionary power. And the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order in connection with the point of order of the gentleman from Arizona. It is all a part of the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order, beginning on line 21, page 34, down to and including the word "forests" in lines 4 and 5, page 36. The same reasons on which the previous ruling was based apply to this, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. I want to call attention, if I may, to the time, and say that it is the intention of the Democrats to hold a caucus in this room after Congress adjourns, and we hoped to get through before dinner to-night. I notice the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] have each an amendment to offer.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When does the gentleman wish us to adjourn?

Mr. GARNER. We want to begin now, at 4 o'clock. We gave notice to that effect.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12272, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WEBSTER (at request of Mr. SUMMERS of Washington), for one day, on account of illness.

To Mr. CULLEN, until further notice, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate concurrent resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution 10.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,500 copies of the national banking act, as amended to date, for the use of the Senate and to be distributed through the Senate document room—

to the Committee on Printing.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 10, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, from the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, submitted a report relative to United States General Hospital No. 21 at Aurora, Colo. (Rept. No. 616), which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. O'CONNELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3977) for the relief of the legal representatives of Donnelly and Egan, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 613), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GLYNN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9046) for the relief of William Malone, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 614), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 390) for the relief of Peter McKay, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 615), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 12419) granting additional compensation to the officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, including nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 12420) providing for the monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) regarding the appointment of commissions to deal with labor and capital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 288) authorizing and directing the Joint Committee on Printing to publish a daily bulletin of public hearings held by committees, subcommittees, and commissions of Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BAER: Resolution (H. Res. 456) to designate a week to be known as liberty week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 102, to equalize the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 102, to equalize the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard with those of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 12421) granting an increase of pension to William H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12422) granting a pension to Mary Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12423) granting a pension to David E. Tipple; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 12424) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Cann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 12425) for the relief of Orlando Ducker; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1418. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 892, New York, opposing the Sterling-Graham peace-time sedition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1419. By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of the Mothers' Club of the fifth ward, Big Rapids, Mich., urging the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1420. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Barnes Drill Co., of Rockford, Ill., opposing the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures for the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1421. Also, petition of the churches of Duran, Ill., favoring the Sims bill, House bill 262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1422. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Kansas City, opposing the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1423. Also, petition of the Lawyers' Club of New York City, favoring the Kenyon Americanization bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1424. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Letter of the acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting petition of employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service at Detroit, Mich., for increase of pay for inspectors and clerks of that service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1425. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Weyerhaeuser, Wis., protesting against sedition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1426. Also, petition of International Union of Timberworkers, Local No. 78, Rhinelander, Wis., protesting against passage of pending sedition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1427. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of J. H. Williams & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1428. Also, petition of the College of the City of New York, Post No. 717, relative to Senate bill 3792, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1429. Also, petition of George S. Ward, president, Ward Baking Co., New York City, urging defeat of Gronna bill, terminating wheat guaranty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1430. Also, petition of American Protective Tariff League, urging revision of the tariff laws and opposing League of Nations as proposed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1431. By Mr. PARKER: Petition of the Hoosick Post, No. 40, of the American Legion, pledging loyalty to the Government, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, indorsing Senate bill 3315; to the Committee on Education.

1433. Also, petition of the directors of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago, urging the return of the railroads to private owners, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1434. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of Conshohocken, Pa., in favor of the Lehibach-Sterling bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 10, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with Thee are the issues of life and death. We stand before Thee to give an account here of our stewardship. We must stand at last before Thee to render an account of the deeds done in the body. Thou dost call us by Thy providence to serve Thee. Thou hast sent us forth to be as an evangel of God, to give Thy will and Thy law to many men. Help us in Thy fear and with Thy favor and under Thy guidance to discharge the duties that are upon us. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 11368) entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to dispose of Senate amendments numbered 114 and 115 in manner and form as if the House had receded from its disagreement to said amendments and had agreed to the same.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. The House did recede, and it is so shown in the printed report, but in the type-